

act to which the Senator refers and which he says was the first bill, and it was the longest bill, that outlined an aircraft program was reported to the Senate and called up during the morning hour. A demand was made that it should be passed by the Senate during the morning hour, and a Senator on the other side made an objection or debated it and took up the time, and it was not passed that day. The next day during the morning hour the bill was passed; and that was the only consideration the Senate gave to it.

Does the Senator remember that the first day when it came in the morning papers of New York in an Associated Press dispatch said, and it was published all over the United States, telling the Senate and the country that on that day this aircraft bill was coming up and that two Senators or three, I think, whom it mentioned by name, were expected to object to it; that the New York World, I think it was, had a long editorial on the very day that it was brought in, published in the morning before the bill was taken up here at 12, denouncing in very severe terms the men who it was said were going to object to its consideration that day; and that one Senator was denounced all over the United States through an Associated Press dispatch because he was going to object to that bill? When it came up the Senator mentioned never said a word. He did not object, and later upon the floor he stated as a question of privilege that he had never read the bill; that he did not know it was coming up that day, and that he had no objection whatever to it.

Those are the circumstances under which that bill passed the Senate. I mention that because the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] very aptly said the other day if we would give a little better consideration to some of these bills we would not be under the necessity afterwards of passing other bills and amending them, and finding we had done poor work. But the very act the Senator mentioned was passed during the morning hour and it was passed, as I remember now, the next day after it was reported, when it had less than four hours for consideration, although it carried an appropriation of \$640,000,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt the Senator's recollection is right about it. Of course, I do not remember everything. I do not think I read that editorial, although I may have done so. I say we ought to have given more consideration to that bill, as we should consider all bills that come before us, but we need not delay them for a month.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me a little further, at the time I had a personal conversation with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] after I had read the dispatch, and he discovered later that it was an Associated Press dispatch in which the announcement was made. It went all over his State, and he received letters of condemnation from all over the United States. He said on the floor of the Senate that he had never talked to a soul on earth in regard to the bill; that he did not have any idea the bill was coming up, and had never read it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with all the Senator has said. As I said, we have passed so many bills without full consideration that we need this Overman bill.

Mr. NORRIS. We were pushed along by the press of the country—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must insist that Senators shall address the Chair, because every minute that is occupied by interruptions is charged against the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to say that if the Overman bill does not do what the amendment proposes, I am inclined to accept the amendment. I want to do just what it proposes. I will look over the two acts to-night, and if I find this bill does not carry out what the Senator from New York proposes I shall be inclined to accept his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very glad to hear the Senator say so. As a matter of course he should be given the privilege of examining the two laws before the amendment is pressed. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the law which I read was approved the 1st of October last, and it is therefore the latest expression of the lawmaking power on the subject. It is a general principle of construction that if there be a conflict between statutes the last expression of the legislature shall prevail. I do not assume that there is any contradiction between the first and the second of these acts; but it is the law upon the subject; and therefore the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is imperatively necessary in my judgment. I am satisfied that even if the construction of his bill by the Senator from North Carolina should convince him that it is already sufficiently broad to provide for the conditions outlined in the amendment of the Senator from New York, we should

nevertheless adopt the amendment, because in that case it certainly can do no harm.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. OVERMAN. It was understood that the amendment would go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the pending amendment.

RECESS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., Thursday, April 25, 1918) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 26, 1918, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 25, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the spirit of heroism resident in the soul of man, which, in the supreme moment, lifts him out of himself and makes him divine; that it is not confined to any class or people, but is universal, suggesting the common origin of man in the one God and Father of us all; manifesting itself in the quiet walks of life, as in times of distress; in peace, as in war; in every home, hamlet, town, city, nation, round the world.

It is the charm of literature, art, and religious achievements and glids the pages of history, sacred and profane, rears monuments in every nation to its heroes.

In this hour of peril heroes are in the making, not only at the front, amid the roar of shot and shell, but in the home; fathers, mothers, wives, children are asking, not will he come back, but has he gone to serve his country and humanity; a heroism sublime and worthy of all commendation, in attestation of the world's great Exemplar, in His heroic sacrifice. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. TILSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered by me before the Aeronautical Engineers of America in New York City a short time ago on the subject of our aviation program.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address that he made in New York City on the subject of aeronautics. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9832) to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing dikes, flumes, and other works to confine the waters of Lowell Creek for the protection of said town.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. I rise to a question of privilege affecting the dignity and proceedings of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24 appears a speech delivered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] entitled "Mr. HEFLIN's reply to Hon. WILLIAM E. MASON, of Illinois." This speech, with one or two minor corrections, I think, in punctuation or abbreviation and transposition of words, and possibly one or two words omitted, is an exact duplicate of the speech made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] on April 23. The gentleman from Alabama did not ask nor was he granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the question of personal privilege to which he rose. And my point is that no Member has the right, after having made a speech upon the floor of the House

which is duly inserted and printed in the Record, to have that speech again printed in the back of the Record upon the following or any other day, without consent being given. Of course, I can understand how the gentleman from Alabama, considering that his motives had been impugned, should desire the greatest publicity to the statements which he made. It may be that he intended to have these remarks inserted in some other publication, the Reclamation Record, or some other document that is printed by the Government, but certainly no permission was given the gentleman to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to reprint the exact proceedings of April 23 in the Record of April 24 when those proceedings had been once printed.

Now, I submit that, with the great shortage of paper with which the Printing Office is confronted, it is hardly becoming the dignity of the House to permit such a matter as this to go by without notice. If there were errors in the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, or if there were errors in the proceedings of the House upon the date when he rose to his question of personal privilege, they could easily have been corrected by him upon request. But certainly there is nothing in the rules of the House that permit this wholesale extension and repetition of proceedings that have once been printed. Therefore, in order to bring the matter properly before the House—

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to be heard, Mr. Speaker, on that.

Mr. WALSH (continuing). I move that the record of the proceedings [Mr. HEFLIN's speech] appearing in the Record for April 24 be expunged from the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], appearing in the Record of April 24, be stricken from the Record.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on the subject.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. I rise to be heard on the motion.

Mr. WALSH. I have not yielded the floor. I will yield to the gentleman if he desires to be heard.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. Will I have right in my own time to speak?

The SPEAKER. The practice and the rule is that the gentleman from Massachusetts has an hour, and at the end of the time, if he wants to move the previous question, or at any time during that period, he has the right to do it. If at the end of the hour he does not move the previous question, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama or any other gentleman who wants to be recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the gentleman will not move the previous question. I would like to be heard. I do not want very much time.

Mr. WALSH. I think it only fair that I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLIN. Fifteen minutes?

Mr. WALSH. I think he ought to make explanation in less time than that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know. Give me 10 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I gave my speech day before yesterday to the messenger, Mr. Robinson, who comes around from time to time to get the manuscript of gentlemen who address the House. I said to him, "I do not want them to make any mistakes in this." He said they would not, but they did. Now, I do not know whether anybody had anything to do with causing the mistake or not. I do not suppose they did, but that Record made me say that I was proceeding under the rule "for political purposes" [laughter], and I disclaimed any such intention from the very start of my speech, and I said that what I was doing was my patriotic duty as I saw it.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion that I had 25,000 copies of a speech printed, and they made an error in that speech at the Printing Office, and Mr. Smith, the Record clerk, made them print the whole copy over again, because they had done me a wrong and had made a mistake in the print of that speech.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman was paying for that?

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not pay for the next copy.

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but if they had not printed according to instructions they would be compelled to print it over. But the gentleman paid the bill?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes. But now the gentleman would permit somebody in the Printing Office to do me an injustice and have the speech containing that injustice go all over the country and put me in a wrong light and make me appear to be saying what I did not say.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has suggested that I could have gotten up here and have had the permanent Record corrected; but that is not sufficient. This Record will be the Record that will be read all over the country, and the permanent Record would not be read, maybe, for a year; and they have put me in a false position before the House and the country.

I want the gentleman to read what is in the Record of April 23, beginning with the words—

I have commended the course of men on both sides, but because I see fit to reply to a Member's speech that he makes upon the floor of this House.

Listen:

I hold, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the Speaker will hold, since the matter is laid before him, that I am proceeding in the line of privilege provided for for political purposes. No; gentlemen. Nothing is further than in the rules. I am not attacking the gentleman from Illinois that from my mind, although one paper in my State has played up his speech, published it in full, and attacking me—a strange thing.

Did you ever hear of such a mixed-up mess of stuff? [Laughter.]

Here is the way they made the mistake: They cut these pages apart; they have 25 men setting up the type at once. They take the scissors and cut the pages, and one man is setting up one part here and another man is setting up another part yonder. That is the way they cut it up. I submit to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I was entirely correct in my position.

I will tell you how I got it published again. I went out here and asked Mr. Smith, the Record clerk, how this happened. He called them up, and they said they would look into it. I said, "I want that speech printed again, or I will bring it to the attention of the House." He took it up with the Printing Office, and they said, "Tell Mr. HEFLIN it will be printed again." Then he asked me what heading to put on it, and I said, "Just say 'Mr. HEFLIN's reply to Mr. MASON.'" That is all.

Mr. Speaker, the first Record has gone to the country, and I want the corrected Record to follow.

It is not sufficient, I repeat, in a case of this kind to correct the permanent Record. The Record as printed to-day is correct. The printing of the corrected copy harms no one. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to save the cost of paper. There are just four pages. I do not think you can make the American people believe that this is purely a matter of trying to save 35 cents and four sheets of paper. [Laughter.] Now, I hope the gentleman, after my explanation, will not insist upon his motion.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I observe the difference in the paragraph which the gentleman has directed attention to and that the lines became transposed; but it does seem to me that the speech ought to go out from one Record or the other, and that if the first proceedings are incorrect it will be just to the gentleman to strike it out there.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no objection to striking out the speech in the first Record and letting this other stand. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion that I made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARNER). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the first remarks in the Record containing his reply to the gentleman from Illinois be stricken from the Record.

Mr. HEFLIN. The first insertion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Now I withdraw the motion I made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his motion.

SPRING WHEAT.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the spring-wheat situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. STEENERSON. The hearings on that subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. LAGUARDIA IN ITALY.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a Member of this House whom all of us know, and whom we have learned to respect and admire during the time of his service here, has manifested splendid patriotism by jeopardizing his political fortunes and the pleasure of his service here by taking upon himself the uniform of our country, and for several months he has been serving in Italy in charge of the student flyers of our country there. The Associated Press of this country some weeks ago carried a brief outline of a most remarkable speech made by Representative LAGUARDIA, of whom I am now speaking. [Applause.] This speech was made at Milan, in Italy. Those of us who have not had the privilege of learning the condition of things in the locality of the city of Milan at the time he made this speech, and for many weeks prior thereto, can hardly appreciate the significance of his remarks to his auditors that day, and the meaning those words carried to these people in a region where apprehension prevails, where disaster was imminent, where patriots had begun to lose hope. It appears that shortly after that address a committee of Italians that had been appropriately appointed by the Crown for a certain governmental purpose, and who more particularly represented the Italians of Trentino, a part of Austrian territory but entirely Italian in nationality, addressed a communication to Mr. LAGUARDIA, which reveals much of the Italian thought and contains a distinct message that I think the membership of the House will be glad to hear. I desire, therefore, to ask that the Clerk in my time read this letter which the committee sent to Representative LAGUARDIA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Commission of Emigration, Trentino. Organized by virtue of the prefectoral decree of Apr. 12, 1916, and approved by Royal decree July 25, 1916; No. 1142.]

MILAN, February 4, 1918.

To the Hon. Mr. LAGUARDIA,
Member of the American Congress:

The Trentino refugees in Italy no longer have here their former representatives.

The deputy from Trent, Cesare Battisti, after having preached the necessity of the war in all Italian cities, was made a prisoner while fighting and was hung by the Austrians.

The deputies from Rovereto and from the Trentino valleys, the mayors, and the local authorities, and the influential men are in Austria either under sentence or interned. They had not fled, believing it their duty to await at their posts the prompt arrival of the liberating army.

At present, therefore, the Trentino refugees in Italy are forming for themselves a vast association which will unite them all, so that with full authority can be made known to the allies, the Italianism and the right of Trentino to become united to Italy and saved from destruction. In the meantime the Trentino Commission of Emigration is speaking in their name.

We want the allies all to know that Trentino is a country completely Italian in race, in language, in customs, and that among this solid mass there is not 1 per cent of Teuton; that she has clung desperately to her language; and that her peoples have stood against German violence and German deceit, but that the war has exhausted and destroyed all her material if not yet her moral forces; and that should she be compelled to remain Austrian we would be irremediably obliterated by the renewed exasperated preponderance of our enemies, the Germans; that they have already confiscated our land and our property; they have deported more than a hundred thousand persons from their country to their ruin or death.

Trentino is of no value to Austria other than as an arm for dominating Italy; on the other hand, Italy can never live freely with such a wedge in her heart. We are an honest little people, trampled on and crushed, massacred and dispersed, but who do not wish to perish.

We do not wish to perish, and therefore we must be rescued from Austrian—that is, German—power. We have proclaimed all this loudly, and in the face of danger. There is no need of a new plebiscite. This would be to-day a nasty derision. It has been proclaimed by our deputies elected by universal suffrage. They are dead, incarcerated, or interned, and their voices to-day are stifled. It has been proclaimed by our mayors and our chiefs, including the clergy and the bishop, who shared the same fate. It has been proclaimed by the thousands of citizens condemned for high treason and whose property was confiscated; our prisoners who came from Russia, about 2,000, while many thousands have demanded it who are now in part, perhaps, arriving in America from Siberia; all the deported ones have demanded it, but above all our volunteers who have no voice but who with the ready offer of their lives cry out to the world the will and the needs of Trentino.

All of this we want to say and to prove to the allies and especially to America and to her great President.

We do not presume to think that our words and our grief can influence the decisions of your country, but since Wilson, in one of the most noble programs known to history, has solemnly proclaimed the right of small, oppressed nationalities to live, we want America to know that if there is a little oppressed people, menaced with destruction, solidly Italian, necessary to complete and assure the independence of Italy it is Trentino; that she looks with firm faith to the great American Nation, which proclaims and sustains to-day the rights of peoples, as

France and America once proclaimed and sustained the rights of the individual, and that she will not withdraw until a final and complete victory.

We present these considerations to you personally trusting that conforming to your very noble and categorical affirmations for final victory expressed by you, and trusting also to the warm sympathy of America for our country, you will cause to be heard the sorrowful but proud voice of Trentino, ready for every sacrifice, however great, for the triumph of her legitimate and sacred revindication.

CARLO ESTERLE.
FRANCO CRIVELLI.
GINO MARZANI.

ACCOUNTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I move a change of reference of H. Res. 307. This resolution having been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, I move that it be rereferred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve a point of order on the motion. May I ask the gentleman if it would be agreeable to him and to the House that we have 10 minutes' debate on this subject, in order that the House may know what it is voting on? I would suggest that the gentleman from Georgia be given five minutes in which to state the position of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and that I be given five minutes in which to reply on behalf of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Mr. BELL. I will say that it would be agreeable to me to make it 10 minutes on a side.

Mr. KEATING. I think five minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be made 20 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I do not think we are justified in taking up the time of the House to a greater extent than 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. That is for the House to decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pending the gentleman's motion, that 10 minutes be allowed on this motion, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] and 5 minutes by myself.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, two or three gentlemen want 4 or 5 minutes each, and I would be glad if the gentleman from Colorado will agree to 10 minutes on a side.

Mr. KEATING. I think the whole thing can be disposed of in 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be 20 minutes debate, 10 minutes to be controlled by myself and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that 20 minutes be allowed for debate, 10 minutes to be controlled by himself and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Will the gentleman from Colorado proceed?

Mr. KEATING. No; "the gentleman from Colorado" feels that he should have the last word on this proposition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Colorado withdraw his point of order which he made but did not state?

Mr. KEATING. I have not.

Mr. WALSH. Then, I make the point of order that we can not discuss this matter with the point of order pending.

Mr. KEATING. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to press if we can arrange the matter of debate. The point of order is this: Under the rules of the House a motion to re-refer a bill must be presented immediately after the reading of the Journal. That is the rule. Other business has been permitted to intervene. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] delivered a speech, and therefore the motion of the gentleman from Georgia is not in order. But, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the matter decided this morning in order that the question of jurisdiction may be determined. Under that suggestion I feel that my original unanimous-consent request should be granted—that is, that 10 minutes' debate should be allowed, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia and 5 minutes to myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has given unanimous consent for 10 minutes on a side. The Chair does not think that the spirit of the rule has been violated because the House gave unanimous consent to the gentleman from Minnesota, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Georgia for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution now before the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and upon which that committee has begun an investigation without any authority whatever, had written on the back of the resolution when filed in the basket the following language:

Directing the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to institute an examination of the accounts and expenditures of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

That is the entire scope of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department as stated on the outside of the resolution; and, while I do not believe that it was written on the back of the resolution to deceive the Speaker, it certainly did deceive the Speaker into referring the resolution to a committee that had no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the resolution. The first paragraph of the resolution reads in the same language that I have just read, but all the rest of the resolution deals with questions that are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department. For example, it says:

The committee is further directed to institute and carry forward an investigation into the conduct and administration of the affairs of the Post Office Department in so far as they concern and apply to the collection, sorting, forwarding, distribution, and handling in any way of mail of the American Expeditionary Force either in this country or abroad.

The committee is further directed to institute and carry forward an investigation into the conduct and administration of the affairs of the Post Office Department in so far as they concern the mail of any of the organizations of the armies of the United States, either Regular, National, or National Guard, within the confines of the United States or any of its Territories or dependencies.

Then it gives them jurisdiction to institute and carry forward an investigation into the conduct and administration of the affairs of the Post Office Department in so far as they concern the mail between the cities of Washington and New York. It goes further and says:

The committee shall further make such recommendations as to reforms in methods and procedure in the department under investigation as may be justified by the evidence taken and as will affect economy and promote efficiency in the future administration of its affairs.

I submit that this resolution goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and that the jurisdiction belongs to the Post Office Committee.

Then it provides that it may appoint a subcommittee, which may administer oaths, appoint experts, send for persons and papers, and may, in effect, reorganize the Post Office Department.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have not seen the resolution nor heard of it, but if what the gentleman says is correct, it increases the jurisdiction and ought to go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution certainly does not belong to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department; but even assuming that it did, I maintain that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and no other committee of the House, would have authority, by the mere introduction of a resolution, to begin an investigation. It would be compelled to wait until the House had passed the resolution before it assumed authority.

That is not all. It has been said by men on the floor of the House that the reason why they wanted the resolution to remain in the possession of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department is that the Post Office Committee will not investigate. I deny that. I deny the truth of the statement made by any man in this House to the effect that the Post Office Committee will not investigate these matters. The Post Office Committee has never faltered in the performance of its duty. I maintain that the statements to the effect that the Post Office Committee would not investigate are intended to deceive Members of the House in order that they may vote authority for an investigation as to matters over which the Committee on Expenditures has no jurisdiction whatever.

I do not think it is fair. I do not think that any committee ought to investigate until this House authorizes it; and surely this resolution is not in such form to-day that the committee over which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] presides would have the right to begin an investigation. I have no objection to an investigation of the Post Office Department. I would welcome any investigation that the House might order; and, as one member of the Post Office Committee, I would do in this case as I have always done in every case—perform my duty fearlessly, without fear or favor to any man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRANCIS], the author of the resolution.

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Speaker, as to the indorsement on the resolution, I imagine that was put on it by the Clerk, because the resolution when introduced by me on April 11 had no indorsement whatsoever.

There is a great deal of unnecessary to-do over the jurisdiction of this committee. There is nothing extraordinary or unusual about this resolution. When I sat down to prepare this resolution I took my book of rules to see what the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, of which I am a member, was, and the first paragraph of the resolution is taken verbatim from the statement in the rules of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANCIS. In a moment. When it comes to the rest of the resolution, I turned back to the records of the House in the Sixty-second Congress, first session, where I found a precedent for the resolution, and that is House resolution No. 109, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and in substance the entire resolution as I have introduced it at this session is based on the resolution introduced by Mr. SAUNDERS in the Sixty-second Congress. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, was considered by the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and was reported out to this House, and on a unanimous-consent day was adopted by this House, and it is a square precedent. In order to enlighten the Members a little further on this, I shall point out that the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this resolution directs an investigation to be made? This resolution has not been passed.

Mr. FRANCIS. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The question is, What authority has the committee to act?

Mr. FRANCIS. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] will answer that. If my resolution is all wrong, then the resolution that was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] was all wrong, for I have followed his resolution.

His resolution provides, first, that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department shall investigate as to whether abuses exist to the prejudice of the public welfare, and that it shall further investigate the amount of work done and the number of hours devoted by postmasters and officials to their work, and that it shall further investigate the time devoted by postmasters to private enterprise and personal vocation; and, further, what degree of public interest has been disregarded in the establishment and discontinuance of post offices, and finally the extent to which postmasters have contributed to the expenses of political campaigns. The rest of the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], which occupies a page and three-quarters, provides that the committee shall make such recommendations as to reforms in methods and procedure in the department under investigation as may be justified by the evidence taken, and that it will effect economy and promote efficiency in the future administration of its affairs. From there on to the end my resolution is taken verbatim from the resolution of the gentleman from Virginia. When the resolution was called up on unanimous-consent day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was in the Chamber, and he asked several critical questions in regard to the resolution; and Mr. SAUNDERS rose to its defense and it went through without any opposition whatsoever; and I submit that my resolution is properly before the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and should be left there.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The Saunders resolution, to which the gentleman has referred, related wholly and entirely to past events, did it not?

Mr. FRANCIS. No.

Mr. GORDON. I wish the gentleman would read from some clause there that does not relate to something wholly and entirely in the past, and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that jurisdiction over expenditures in all of these departments is limited to past events.

Mr. KEATING. How can we investigate expenditures until they have been made? Necessarily they relate to events in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. FRANCIS. The first paragraph provides that the Committee on Expenditures is directed to carry forward an investi-

gation as to whether abuses exist. That refers to the present as well as to the past.

Mr. GORDON. It refers to past expenditures wholly and entirely.

Mr. FRANCIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say to the gentleman that the first paragraph of this resolution, of course, confines the committee to an investigation of expenditures, and they have that right without any resolution.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. No; I have not the time. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRANCIS], the author of the resolution, has stated, he has a perfect precedent in the Saunders resolution adopted by this House in the Sixty-second Congress. That resolution was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, reported back from that committee, adopted by this House, and an investigation held. The Committee on Expenditures of the present House might have taken advantage of this situation, might have met and reported upon this resolution, and in that way have clinched its jurisdiction. We were notified five or six days ago that this question would be raised. We preferred not to indulge in any sharp practice. We wanted the House to settle this question of jurisdiction. The Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department is charged with the duty of investigating the expenditures of the Post Office Department. This Congress has granted the Post Office Department a great appropriation for the purpose of establishing a mail service between this country and the expeditionary forces in Europe. How has that money been expended? Has the Post Office Department made good? Are the soldiers in Europe receiving the kind of service that Congress intended the money should provide? I submit that those questions are clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and those are the only questions we have attempted to consider.

Gentlemen have said that without waiting for the passage of the resolution we have initiated a hearing, or an "investigation," as they have described it. They confuse a hearing on a resolution which has been referred to a committee with a formal investigation where witnesses may be sworn. The Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, when this resolution was referred to it, undertook to ascertain if there was necessity for the kind of investigation provided in the resolution, and we called upon certain officials of the Post Office Department to appear and give us information as to how they had expended the money provided by Congress for the purpose of furnishing mail service between this country and Europe. We expected to follow that by ascertaining the kind of mail service they had provided for the Army camps.

The committee has proceeded without the suggestion of partisanship. It has not desired to embarrass the Post Office Department or any other department of the Government.

The committee has felt that this House and the people of this country wanted to know what was wrong with the mail service between this country and France, and it has proceeded in a proper fashion to ascertain the material facts. After it has procured sufficient facts upon which to base a report to this House, it will come back to this House and report on this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think he has authority to investigate under this resolution before the House acts upon the resolution?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Colorado is not "investigating." The gentleman from Illinois is confusing an investigation with a hearing. Why every committee of this House when a bill or a resolution is referred to it, if the bill or resolution is of sufficient importance, conducts a hearing which will enable members of the committee to determine whether they want to recommend the adoption of the bill or resolution to the House, and that is all the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department has done, and I submit it is well within its jurisdiction.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. GOOD. Is not it true, if it is as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, that if there is a change to be made it ought not to go to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads but

ought to go to the Committee on Rules; that is, providing any change is to be made at all?

Mr. KEATING. Under the precedents of the House, the precedents established in the Sixty-second Congress by the party now in control of the House, led by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], the place for this resolution is the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and the Speaker or whoever made the reference did exactly right in sending it to that committee. [Applause.]

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I seem to have been drawn in an unexpected fashion into this controversy. It is true that I was the patron of the resolution referred to, but I made no request for the reference of that resolution to the Committee on Expenditures, or to any other committee. It was referred in due course, and the reference was never contested. Hence no precedent has been created. Many bills are erroneously referred. These references are sometimes contested, and sometimes not. In the case of the resolution referred to by the gentleman from New York, I submit that upon the facts an unchallenged reference does not establish the correctness, and propriety of that reference. Given time to make the necessary inquiry, I could point out many references that on motion could have been corrected, if that correction had been desired. Such erroneous references do not create binding precedents. At best they can be regarded as persuasive only. The resolution in question plainly does not belong to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department. Looking to the Manual it will be noted that all subjects relating to the post office, and post roads belong to the Committee on the Post Office. That is a sweeping grant of power. The Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office has a limited jurisdiction, relating to certain defined subjects. That jurisdiction is fixed by the precise and guarded language in the Manual defining the scope of the work of this committee. There is no sweeping grant of power to the Committee on Expenditures. What it may do is summed up under a number of detailed heads. Unquestionably a portion of this resolution relates to powers that belong to the Committee on Expenditures, but I take it as a matter of sound parliamentary law that you can not associate matter that in large degree belongs to one committee, with other matter in lesser degree that belongs to another committee, and then claim jurisdiction of the whole subject matter for the latter committee. Yet that is precisely what is proposed to be done by this resolution. Permit me to read the resolution, because the language used clearly indicates to which of the two committees now contending for jurisdiction, the resolution ought to be referred. The first paragraph unquestionably contains matter that belongs to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department. Reading further, we find the following:

The committee is further directed to institute and carry forward an investigation into the conduct and administration of the affairs of the Post Office Department in so far as they concern and apply to the collection, sorting, forwarding, distribution, and handling in any way of mail of the American expeditionary forces either in this country or abroad.

The Manual provides that subjects relating to the post office shall be referred to the Post Office Committee. Having that sweeping statement in mind, is there doubt in the mind of any Member of this House, that the investigation proposed in the language cited, is a subject appropriately belonging to the Post Office Committee?

A comprehensive and searching investigation into the administration of the Post Office Department, in an important field is proposed. It is not a matter of figures, of details, of expenditures, of accounts, but of inquiry into general departmental capabilities on a large scale in a wide field. Surely this is a subject relating to the post office. The same comments may be made on the investigations proposed in the paragraphs which follow the paragraph cited. They are not investigations of details of accounts and expenditures, but are inquiries relating to general administration of large activities at home and abroad. The committee to which the general subject of the Post Office Department is committed, should conduct such inquiries.

There is just one further suggestion I wish to make in this connection. If the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department has the right to conduct these investigations, by virtue of the language used in the first paragraph of the resolution, then all that follows that paragraph so far as it relates to the investigations proposed, is surplusage.

If the Committee on Expenditures is entitled to proceed by virtue of the authority afforded by the Manual, then they ought to rest on that language, and content themselves with asking

for the power to compel the attendance of witnesses to administer oaths. Obviously the committee distrusted its authority to conduct these specific investigations, and preferred to secure it by specific grant. The resolution associates matters plainly belonging to the Committee on Expenditures, with matter that belongs to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with a view to conferring jurisdiction of the entire subject matter upon the Committee on Expenditures. More of the matters proposed to be done by this resolution belong to the Committee on Post Offices, than to the Committee on Expenditures. Hence as between these committees, this resolution should be referred to the Post Office Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] has a minute and a half left.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Without interfering with the gentleman from Georgia, is it agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think I must object to that. We must go on.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. All I want to do is to speak in the interest of orderly procedure. I am not at all interested in the contest between the two committees.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I only take the floor to speak in the interest of orderly procedure. It is a matter of indifference to me to which committee this may go, the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department or the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. But, as a matter of fact, under the practice of the House this resolution ought to go to the Committee on Rules. Why? Because it seeks to extend the power of one of the regular standing committees of the House, whether it be the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads or the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and in order to extend that power and authority, then, in the regular way, it ought to go to the Committee on Rules and be reported from that committee.

For instance, on page 3 it says:

The committee is further empowered to employ, from time to time, such stenographers as may be necessary—

And so forth.

That part of it would probably go to the Committee on Accounts, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRANCIS] will doubtless look after that when the time comes. It authorizes the administration of oaths. Under the unbroken practice, wherever there has been a contest, in order to obtain additional power under the rules, such resolutions as this have been referred to the Committee on Rules and reported from that committee.

Now, it is a matter of indifference to me. As I say, I only speak in the interest of orderly procedure, and it seems to me the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] might very well change his motion and refer it to the Committee on Rules rather than the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, because exactly the same question would arise again if it be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask a question for my own satisfaction. Where a resolution or bill has matter that is within the jurisdiction of one committee and also subject matter that is clearly within the jurisdiction of another committee, how is the committee to which the resolution or bill should be referred determined?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Those questions often arise, but those are legislative propositions, if the gentleman will permit. This is not a legislative proposition. This is a question of investigation and the question of power to be conferred upon a committee. This does not involve legislation in any way. It involves the question of what power should be given to a committee, and for that reason ought to go to the Committee on Rules, the regular committee of the House that deals with those matters.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Any investigation that has to be conducted in this matter has to take in three departments, the War Depart-

ment, the Post Office Department, and the transportation department in France. Now, the sole question in my mind is, which committee has full powers to conduct such an investigation, as there are 37,000 bags of mail over there at one of the ports, belonging to the American troops, undistributed at the present time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, we really have not reached that stage yet. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] stated that such hearings as have been had were wholly for the purpose of determining whether this resolution should be reported to the House, if I understood the gentleman correctly.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We have not reached that stage of investigation as yet, except on the question of whether the resolution should be reported to the House and acted upon by the House.

Mr. KEATING. If there was a state of affairs that would justify it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And that being the case, I submit to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL], in the interests of orderly procedure it ought to go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry. I wish to ask the Chair if it would be possible, under the existing conditions, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads having directed the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] to move to transfer this bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, for him to move to send the resolution to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The opinion of the Chair is that it would not be in order unless the chairman of the committee would authorize him to move that it go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As it can not be amended on the floor, the gentleman can not ask for another reference. He could ask unanimous consent, if desired, to have it referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] could withdraw his motion, and if to-morrow morning the committee offered a resolution to refer it, they could refer it there.

The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has expired. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I can not tell whether or not this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Rules. But it is very clear and evident to my mind that it does not belong to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department. There is but one portion of this resolution that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department has any jurisdiction over whatever, and that is the first paragraph. This is a sweeping resolution, and it empowers the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to investigate the conduct and the administration of affairs of the Post Office Department in domestic and foreign mails. This they have no jurisdiction over whatever. It has been intimated, so I am informed, and I believe said—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman were a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department how would he proceed to investigate the expenditures in the foreign mail service that he has referred to without finding out how the money was expended?

Mr. BELL. I would go to the Post Office Department for the information.

Mr. KEATING. That is what the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department has done. That is all that it has done.

Mr. BELL. It is further stated that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would not make the investigation. We resent that. We would, but we would not until the resolution is referred to our committee. When that is done we will make an investigation. I think we have jurisdiction over it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pending the putting of the motion, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado objects. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL].

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 91.

Mr. BELL. I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks for tellers.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll. Those who favor the motion of the gentleman from Georgia will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 151, answered "present" 9, not voting 114, as follows:

YEAS—156.

Alexander	Donovan	Iazaro	Saunders, Va.
Almon	Doolittle	Lea, Cal.	Schall
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Aswell	Doughton	Leshner	Shallenberger
Ayres	Drane	Linthicum	Sherley
Bankhead	Eagle	Loneragan	Sisson
Barkley	Edmonds	McAndrews	Slayden
Beakes	Evans	McKenzie	Small
Bell	Fisher	McKeown	Smith, C. B.
Black	Flood	McLemore	Smith, T. F.
Blackmon	Foster	Madden	Snook
Blanton	Fuller, Mass.	Maher	Stegall
Borland	Gallivan	Mansfield	Stedman
Brand	Gandy	Montague	Steele
Britten	Garner	Moon	Steenerson
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tex.	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Brumbaugh	Glass	Oldfield	Sterling, Ill.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Oliver, Ala.	Sterling, Pa.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	Oliver, N. Y.	Stevenson
Candler, Miss.	Graham, Ill.	Olney	Tague
Cannon	Griffin	O'Shaunessy	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Hardy	Overstreet	Thomas
Carlin	Hayden	Padgett	Tillman
Carter, Okla.	Heaton	Paige	Vinson
Claypool	Helm	Park	Walker
Cleary	Helvering	Phelan	Walsh
Coady	Hensley	Quin	Watkins
Collier	Holland	Ragsdale	Watson, Va.
Connally, Tex.	Houston	Rainey, J. W.	Weaver
Cox	Hull, Iowa	Ramseyer	Welling
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Randall	Welty
Decker	Igoe	Rayburn	Whaley
Delaney	Ireland	Riordan	Williams
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Robinson	Wilson III.
Denton	Juul	Romjue	Wilson, La.
Dickinson	Kehoe	Rouse	Wilson, Tex.
Dies	Key, Ohio	Rubey	Wise
Dixon	Kincheloe	Russell	Wright
Dominick	Larsen	Sabath	Young, Tex.

NAYS—151.

Anderson	Fess	Kinkaid	Reed
Anthony	Focht	Knutson	Robbins
Bacharach	Fordney	Kraus	Roberts
Baer	Francis	La Follette	Rogers
Bland	Frear	Langley	Rose
Booher	Freeman	Lehlbach	Rowe
Bowers	French	Little	Sanders, Ind.
Browne	Fuller, Ill.	Lobeck	Sanders, N. Y.
Burroughs	Garland	London	Sanford
Butler	Gillett	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Campbell, Kans.	Glynn	Lufkin	Sherwood
Carter, Mass.	Good	Lundeen	Siegel
Cary	Goodall	McArthur	Sinnott
Chandler, Okla.	Gould	McClulloch	Sloan
Church	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Clason	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Connelly, Kans.	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Stafford
Cooper, Wis.	Hadley	Mapes	Stines
Crago	Hamilton, Mich.	Mays	Sweet
Cramton	Hamilin	Merritt	Temple
Crosser	Haskell	Miller, Minn.	Timberlake
Currie, Mich.	Hastings	Miller, Wash.	Treadway
Dallinger	Haugen	Moores, Ind.	Van Dyke
Darrow	Hawley	Morgan	Vestal
Davidson	Hayes	Morin	Voigt
Davis	Hersey	Mott	Volstead
Dill	Hilliard	Mudd	Waldow
Dillon	Hollingsworth	Neely	Walton
Dowell	Huddleston	Nolan	Ward
Dunn	Humphreys	Osborne	Wason
Elliott	Hutchinson	Overmyer	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	White, Me.
Emerson	Kahn	Peters	White, Ohio
Esch	Keating	Pratt	Winslow
Fairchild, B. L.	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild, G. W.	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker	Woodyard
Fairfield	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Young, N. Dak.
Farr	Kless, Pa.	Reavis	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Barnhart	Fields	Moore, Pa.	Rodenberg
Browning	Garrett, Tenn.	Pou	Wingo
Cantrill			

NOT VOTING—114.

Austin	Foss	LaGuardia	Scully
Beshlin	Gallagher	Lever	Sells
Buchanan	Gard	Littlepage	Shackleford
Burnett	Godwin, N. C.	Lunn	Shouse
Caldwell	Graham, Pa.	McClintic	Sims
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, Ala.	McCormick	Slomp
Carew	Gray, N. J.	McFadden	Snell
Chandler, N. Y.	Griegg	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Clark, Pa.	Hamill	Martin	Strong
Cooper, Ohio	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Sullivan
Cooper, W. Va.	Harrison, Miss.	Meeker	Sumners
Copley	Harrison, Va.	Mondell	Swift
Costello	Heflin	Nelson	Switzer
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Nichols, Mich.	Talbott
Dale, N. Y.	Hicks	Norton	Taylor, Colo.
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Parker, N. J.	Templeton
Dempsey	Howard	Platt	Thompson
Denison	Husted	Polk	Tilson
Dewalt	Jacoway	Porter	Tinkham
Dooling	James	Powers	Towner
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Vare
Dupré	Jones	Rainey, H. T.	Venable
Dyer	Kearns	Rankin	Watson, Pa.
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Rowland	Webb
Elston	Kettner	Rucker	Wood, Ind.
Estopinal	King	Sanders, La.	Zihlman
Ferris	Kitchin	Scott, Iowa	
Flynn	Kreider	Scott, Pa.	

So the motion of Mr. BELL was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. JONES with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. POLK with Mr. KING.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. MCFADDEN.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. MARTIN with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY with Mr. MASON.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. RUCKER with Miss RANKIN.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANX.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SNELL.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. VENABLE with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. BESHLIN with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. DALE of Vermont.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. DUPRE with Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. BUCHANAN with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DENISON.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DYER.

Mr. GARD with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. MASON. I am not absolutely sure whether I was or not. I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote. I am not sure that I can bring myself within the rule. I was behind the railing and had just come in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, was this a call of the House or just a roll call?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A yea-and-nay vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This resolution goes to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

On motion of Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

HERVEY E. DAMERON (H. REPT. NO. 518).

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 321.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Hervey E. Dameron, clerk to WILLIAM A. JONES, a Representative from the State of Virginia at the time of his death, April 17, 1918, the sum of \$166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

BERT W. KENNEDY AND FRANK W. COLLIER (H. REPT. NO. 519).

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 315.

Resolved, That the salaries of the messengers to the minority, Bert W. Kennedy and Frank W. Collier, be increased to \$1,800 each: *Provided*, That the said increase be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, there are four of these messengers who do the same service, two of whom draw \$1,800, and this is to equalize the pay of the others.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. We could not hear what the gentleman from Georgia said.

Mr. PARK. I stated that there are four of these men who perform similar service, two of whom get \$1,800 and the others \$1,500. This resolution is to equalize their pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that we are all acquainted with the worthy gentlemen, Messrs. Kennedy and Collier, whose salaries this resolution seeks to increase. I wish to inquire whether the committee has made any investigation as to whether this will occasion an increase of the salaries of other employees performing similar duties?

Mr. PARK. Nothing like that has been discussed in the committee, and I know of nothing of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. For instance, there is on the Republican side Mr. Chaffee, who has charge of the telephone booths, and who is engaged from before the House convenes until its close in very exacting service. He receives a salary of \$1,500. There are other employees of the House, perhaps on the Democratic side, who perform like service, who are receiving \$1,500. I wish to inquire whether the Committee on Accounts have considered any general raise of the salaries of the employees of the House?

Mr. PARK. No; we are not considering any.

Mr. STAFFORD. And whether this will be used as a precedent to increase the salaries of other employees of the House?

Mr. PARK. We only consider those matters when they are introduced in the regular way and referred to the committee through the regular channel. The committee has not discussed or considered anything of the kind indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman recognize the need of increasing the salaries of other employees of the House if we are going to increase the salaries of some?

Mr. PARK. We will consider that when we come to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee has not considered it up to the present time?

Mr. PARK. It has not been called to our attention.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that on our side of the House there are five men, three of whom receive \$1,800. The other two receive \$1,500. They do practically the same work.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am now pointing out another gentleman who does even more exacting work. That is the telephone page, Mr. Chaffee, who receives \$1,500.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have no objection to increasing his salary, but I am speaking now of these two men, who are old employees. I have no objection to anyone having a raise who is entitled to it. I know of no reason why these two men should not have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain whether the committee have made any investigation as to general increases of the salaries of House employees, or whether they are just singling out a few worthy employees for increases.

Mr. PARK. I have answered the gentleman three or four times. The matter has not been called to the attention of the committee, and, so far as I know, has not been called to the attention of any member of the committee. We are simply seeking to do for that side what was done for this side.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand the chairman of the committee, the majority employees performing the same service are receiving \$1,800, and it is now proposed to give these minority employees the same amount?

Mr. PARK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KITCHIN. One of the gentlemen who has been mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin had his salary increased from \$1,200 to \$1,500 in the last session.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am quite aware of that fact; but I am also quite well aware of the fact that the gentleman who is performing even more exacting duties than the gentlemen whose salaries have been advanced is receiving only \$1,500.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution raises the salaries of what two employees?

Mr. PARK. Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Collier.

Mr. FERRIS. I know Mr. Kennedy, but I do not know Mr. Collier.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman does not know him by name, but he sees him here every day. I introduced this resolution. I knew nothing about the other employees. The committee acted upon the resolution at my request. I asked for only two raises. I have no objection to others, of course.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to inquire of the chairman of the committee if there has been any effort to equalize the salaries of the assistant clerks to committees?

Mr. PARK. That matter has not been considered by the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. For example, the assistant clerk to my committee, which is a busy committee, only gets \$1,200. You can not hold an assistant clerk any longer at that salary. I have used the salary, giving half to a messenger and half to another clerk in order to get along. I find that almost all of the other assistant clerks are getting \$1,500 to \$1,800. I am not complaining, but it seems to me that some time the salaries of these clerks ought to be equalized so that the assistant clerks will get the same pay. I wondered if the gentleman had given any attention to this class of employees.

Mr. PARK. No; it has not been called to the attention of the committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL (H. REPT. NO. 515).

Mr. SISSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported a bill (H. R. 11692) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and with accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. STAFFORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. J. Res. 124, providing for the registration of young men who have become 21 since the 5th day of June, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. J. Res. 124, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of

the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if it is absolutely necessary that this legislation should be brought about now in order to supply an army of the United States?

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that that is the opinion of the War Department. They expect to have this registration on the 5th of June, the anniversary of the first draft, and unless this bill becomes a law shortly the machinery can not be put into operation.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked that question for the reason that by a special rule we have a bill which I am very desirous of having disposed of at the earliest date possible. Of course, if the War Department says that in order to secure this army it is necessary for this legislation to be passed now, I shall be obliged to give way.

Mr. DENT. I will state further that if there is no objection to the present consideration of this resolution, I propose to submit another request which will limit debate to two hours, and that is agreed to by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that as soon as this is disposed of it will be in order to take up the other matter which I referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the present opinion of the occupant of the chair.

Mr. FOSTER. With the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that the War Department believes that this legislation is necessary to secure an army, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other half by myself; that during the debate such amendments may be offered as any Member desires; and that at the expiration of two hours of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all pending amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other half by himself, and that during the general debate amendments may be offered, and at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what amendments may be offered, and I have no objection to having a vote at the end of two hours' debate on the bill. As I say, I have no information of what amendments may be offered, but an amendment might be offered that should be debated under the five-minute rule. Is the gentleman aware as to whether amendments will be offered?

Mr. DENT. I only know of two amendments that are likely to be offered outside of the committee amendments. One relates to the action of the Military Committee of the House in striking out that part of the Senate resolution which exempts divinity and medical students, and the other is an amendment which was offered in the committee, which is not a part of the resolution, providing that those who are registered under this resolution shall go to the foot of the list.

Mr. DOWELL. I did not hear what the gentleman said the first one was.

Mr. DENT. The first one relates to the action of the House in striking out the exemption of divinity and medical students.

Mr. CANNON. That has not been enacted.

Mr. DENT. No; but the gentleman asked me what amendments I thought would be offered.

Mr. CANNON. That is a subject for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DENT. This bill is on the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can move the previous question at any time. These amendments might give rise to debate where a number of Members would want a little time.

Mr. DENT. If we can have a general understanding in regard to it, I do not believe that the debate is going to last two hours. There is no member of the committee on the Democratic side who has asked me for any time, and I know of nobody that wants any, except on one amendment. I do not know that the debate will last two hours, but if anything should happen by which any amendment is offered, or anything that should develop

that is not now anticipated, there will be no difficulty in extending the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Resolved, etc., That all male persons, citizens of the United States or residing in the United States, who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, shall be subject to registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, and that upon proclamation by the President, stating the time and place of such registration, it shall be the duty of all such persons, except such persons as in said proclamation may be exempted from registration, to present themselves for and submit to registration under the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1917, and they shall be registered in the same manner and subject to the same requirements and liabilities as those previously registered under the terms of said act.

Sec. 2. That after the day set under section 1 hereof for the registration by proclamation by the President at such intervals as the President may from time to time prescribe, the President may require that all male persons, citizens of the United States or residing in the United States, who have attained the age of 21 years since the last preceding date of registration, and on or before the next day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, except such persons as in the proclamation by the President stating the time and place of such registration may be exempted from registration, shall be registered in the same manner and subject to the same requirements and liabilities as those previously registered under the terms of said act: *Provided*, That students who are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools, and students who are preparing for the practice of medicine and surgery in recognized medical schools, at the time of the approval of this act shall be exempt from the selective draft prescribed in the act of May 18, 1917; and that students entering such theological or divinity schools after the approval of this act and during the continuance of the war, and who would be subject to any future registration as provided for in this act, may upon the recommendation or request of the president or dean of such school be exempt from the selective draft by order of the President.

Sec. 3. That all such persons when registered shall be liable to military service and to draft under the terms of said act approved May 18, 1917, under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of said act.

Sec. 4. That all such persons shall be subject to the terms and provisions and liabilities of said act approved May 18, 1917, in all respects as if they had been registered under the terms of said act, and every such person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of said act and of this joint resolution upon the publication of any such proclamation by the President.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "States," strike out the word "or" and insert the words "and all male persons."

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "in said proclamation may be exempted from registration" and insert the words "are exempt from registration under the act of May 18, 1917, and any act or acts amendatory thereof."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the word "the" where it occurs the second time in the line and insert the word "said."

Page 2, line 21, after the word "States," strike out the word "or" and insert the words "and all male persons."

Page 2, line 25, and page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "in the proclamation by the President stating the time and place of such registration may be exempted from registration" and insert the words "are exempt from registration under the act of May 18, 1917, and any act or acts amendatory thereof."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "act," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution is so well understood by the House that a very brief statement of it only is necessary. It provides, in short, that there shall be registered and subject to the draft all young men arriving at the age of 21 years since the 5th day of July of last year, and automatically each year during the present emergency. The House Committee on Military Affairs amended the resolution as passed by the Senate by limiting its provisions to the present emergency, so that it will be perfectly manifest that it is war legislation and intended only for this emergency. The second amendment proposed by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, striking out the word "or" in line 4 and inserting the words "and all male persons," was intended manifestly, as appears upon its face, to get a registration, although not liable to military service, of all persons, including aliens, in the country within this age, which would not have been done under the resolution as passed by the Senate. The next amendment on page 2 changes the language in the resolution as passed by the Senate. The language of the resolution as passed by the Senate exempts from the registration such persons as in said proclamation of the President may be exempted from registration. I do not know and the committee did not know whether or not that was intended to enlarge the power of the President to add to those exempted from registration, but the Committee thought that the language should be more

specific and clear and provide for the exemption of those who were exempted from registration under the original draft, and such is the effect of that amendment. The only other amendment is the amendment striking out the proviso exempting theological and medical students from registration.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state who were exempted under the original act?

Mr. DENT. The Vice President of the United States, the officers, legislative, executive, and judicial, of the United States and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, regularly or duly ordained ministers of religion, students who at the time of the approval of the act were preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools, and all persons in the military and naval service of the United States.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And the committee restricted the exemption list which is given to the President to the original list?

Mr. DENT. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very clear statement made by the chairman of the committee, I do not desire to take up any of the time of the House at this time, but I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a statement from the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, which I ask to have read in my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The war shipping committee of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, in the face of the present necessity for proper housing of workmen at Hog Island made manifest by the action of the Emergency Fleet Corporation in commandeering homes in West Philadelphia, wish to call the attention of the citizens of Philadelphia and their Congressmen, as well as the officers of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, to the great need of pushing forward in some form the project of building houses in the available districts of West and South Philadelphia.

The building season is now at hand, and the work should be commenced promptly in order that the houses should be available at the earliest possible date.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, a situation has recently arisen in Philadelphia of sufficient importance, I feel, to engage the attention of the House. It involves an unfortunate and congested condition, due to efforts to house our new shipyard employees. Last week several hundred citizens of the section of Philadelphia known as West Philadelphia met in Liberty Hall to discuss ways and means to prevent real estate speculators from depriving the tenants in that locality of their homes. I may say that this locality is adjacent to the Hog Island Shipyard, and near those other great war industrial plants such as the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the Remington Arms Co., the Westinghouse, and numerous others, and the demand for houses there has become extreme.

Following that meeting hundreds of protests have come to me as the Representative of that district saying that the writers had been ordered to either buy these houses or vacate. A certain number of days have been given for the tenants to purchase or get out. On Monday last I joined a delegation of these people and met the United States district attorney, Mr. Kane, in the Federal building. We found in the list of those who are being evicted many Government employees, men who are working at the Hog Island plant, men who are working on the railroads, letter carriers, and families dependent upon husbands, sons, or brothers who are in the service. There was one particularly pathetic case in this list among many others. This was the case of a woman who has three sons, upon whom she was entirely dependent. One of the sons is with the Army in France, another is in the draft, and the third one is in the hospital. This woman was notified that within so many days she must either purchase the house in which she lives or get out on the street. I told her to absolutely ignore the notice, no matter from what source it came, as she was protected by the soldiers' and sailors' civil rights law, and that advice was confirmed by the United States district attorney.

Now, the proposition, it seems to me, is this: Owing to the vast number of people coming into this section to work in the various Government plants there are not houses enough to take care of them, and real estate men, who are willing to trade upon the necessities of the people, have evidently been taking advantage of this situation. It would seem from these hundreds of communications, which set forth the complaints of the citizens, that real estate operators to a certain extent have agreed among themselves to turn these people out in order that they may sell these houses at increased prices or secure a higher rental. I felt as if this was only a profiteering conspiracy on

the part of real estate operators, but it now seems to have developed into a commandeering proposition on the part of the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

This morning I called upon Mr. Hurley, president of the Shipping Board, and he tells me that they have commandeered 500 houses in that locality; that it is not their purpose to take houses that are occupied, but only to take houses in the course of erection and those that are vacant. But I must confess I can not fully see the difference between compelling or having some one else to cause these people to vacate these houses, whether done directly or indirectly by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. These people are a patriotic people. They have, as far as their limited means would permit, subscribed to the liberty bonds, and they have been told that if they can buy liberty bonds they can buy houses. It is impossible, however, with the limited amount of money that they can save to purchase houses. They may not, and some of them are not, able to meet these terms, but they can and do buy \$50 or \$100 bonds, as I know from many cases that have come to my attention. I do not wish to criticize the Shipping Board; in fact, I have been one who has on all occasions commended their work, especially in the Hog Island plant. The amount of work they have done there under adverse circumstances is almost beyond the belief of man, and the great progress made so overreaches and overlaps the mistakes and extravagance they have made that it is entitled to our commendation and not to our condemnation. But in this matter I can not help but feel that an error has been made. The board was given an opportunity to erect houses, and I think that is the only solution—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. DARROW. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What has become of the housing proposition itself?

Mr. DARROW. The authority has been given, and I think that this is one of the points where it was recognized to be needed more than any other. I think for some unforeseen reason the housing program has been, temporarily at least, set aside and that they have not proceeded along that line.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has been a patriotic Member of the House, and I know he has been a defender of the purposes of the Shipping Board and would not make a complaint unless he felt warranted in doing it. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Emergency Fleet Corporation, or at least the American International Corporation, started this housing business, so far as planning is concerned, at least three months ago, but has not produced any houses up to date?

Mr. DARROW. I think the gentleman is quite correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DARROW. May I have two or three minutes more?

Mr. KAHN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to send this editorial from one of our newspapers to the desk and have it read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield at that point for one more question?

Mr. DARROW. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is a matter of such grave importance in connection with the general housing plan I think it ought to be clearly understood. The Shipping Board has had the power to go ahead with the housing for some time. The law was enacted and, I think, went into effect the 1st of March, giving power to commandeer or construct, and so forth; yet nothing has been done in the matter of house construction up to the present time. As a matter of fact, building plans have been changed, and transportation arrangements have been negotiated with a view of using houses already occupied rather than to construct new ones. That is the fact.

Mr. DARROW. So I understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Shipping Board has abandoned its plans of erecting houses near by the yard?

Mr. DARROW. I understand the Shipping Board decided or gave out yesterday or to-day that they would probably go ahead now and build some houses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some additional houses? And meanwhile the fact is that the occupants of the houses in West Philadelphia, some of whose sons are already in the public service or in France, and some of whom are already doing war work for the Government, are facing eviction.

Mr. DARROW. That is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DARROW. May I have five minutes additional?

Mr. KAHN. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. DARROW. I would ask that the editorial be read. It is from the Philadelphia Inquirer of yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The editorial will be read in the time of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEIZING HOUSES FOR HOG ISLAND WORKERS.

For months the Emergency Fleet Corporation amused itself by drawing plans for the erection of houses for Hog Island workers. Tired of its game, it now seizes houses over the heads of tenants and turns them into the streets to hunt for other houses which have no existence.

It is a serious matter, this eviction, and wholly without justification, since dwellings could and should have been erected by wholesale long ago. The resort to it is but another evidence of the incompetency that has stamped itself all over the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Federal Shipping Board from the start.

Building operations have practically ceased in this city, and the demand for dwellings far outruns the supply. Only the Government can build. Only the Government can command the materials and the labor. It should have attended to the needs of Hog Island by constructive methods. Instead, the Emergency Fleet Corporation has played with red tape and wasted weeks upon weeks of valuable time, only to deprive numerous families of the roofs that have sheltered them.

Surely it was high time that Mr. Schwab was brought in to build ships. It is a pity that he was not brought in long ago and given authority to build houses as well.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, I only have introduced this editorial to show the situation there, not that I approve of all the criticisms made, though I do think that paper has the reputation of being conservative and not given to extreme statements; but the people are aroused, and I felt that it was time something was done to relieve the situation and begin the construction of houses that have been authorized by Congress.

Mr. FESS. Will my friend yield?

Mr. DARROW. I will.

Mr. FESS. In the statement that the gentleman does not approve of all that the editorial states, the gentleman does, however, approve of the statement that the country will have confidence now of what the Shipbuilding Corporation will do under the leadership of Mr. Schwab.

Mr. DARROW. Absolutely; not that they may not have had that confidence before, but they will feel doubly secure now. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I think so.

Mr. DARROW. I yield back the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman yield back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman used four minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], the chairman of the committee, now use some of his time?

Mr. DENT. I will say that I do not know as anyone on this side desires time. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] desires time, I will yield to him.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of one of these gentlemen in charge of this bill. First, how many men will this bill furnish?

Mr. KAHN. It is estimated there will be between 700,000 and 1,000,000 men who will be registered under the bill.

Mr. DENT. Annually.

Mr. ROBBINS. It is stated here in the letter appended to the committee report, signed by the Secretary of War, that this new classification plan of the War Department will segregate in class 1 those registrants who can serve the Nation with the least possible disturbance of the economic conditions. Is it the intention to classify in class 1 all of these young men who have attained the age of 21 since the registration day under the selective-draft law?

Mr. KAHN. They will all be given the questionnaires, and they will fill them out as the registrants have done heretofore. Then the local boards will classify them accordingly.

Mr. ROBBINS. They will be classified under the act of May 18, 1917—known as the general draft law?

Mr. KAHN. No. They will be classified in accordance with the bill that was passed here the other day, the quota bill. They will be given questionnaires, just as the registrants under the first registration law were given them, and according to their answers to the questionnaires they will be classified.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. FESS. Under this bill, if the annual increment to the Army would be from 700,000 to 1,000,000, after all exemptions are taken, what is the estimate of the increment of actual fighting soldiers?

Mr. KAHN. Well, the War Department, of course, can not give us more than just an estimate. It is probable that we can depend upon 500,000 to 700,000 men ready to go to the colors.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, Col. Repington made the statement that Germany could not put in action, with

all exemptions counted out and ascertained, of the age of from 16 to 18, more than 440,000 a year, while Great Britain would put in probably 350,000 and France 250,000, exempting all classes of legal exemption. If that statement were true, and if this army is to be an army of that number, it looks favorable to us.

Mr. KAHN. How true the figures are that come out of Germany I do not know. There was an article in the newspapers the other day to the effect that Germany was just calling out her class of 1918 or 1919, and that 550,000 soldiers were included in that class. Now, those are German soldiers; but the armies of the central powers also include the soldiers of Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria. How many soldiers these countries will be able to furnish every year I do not know. The 550,000 referred to in the dispatches are Germans, so that I take it the central powers will be able to furnish a great many more than 400,000 soldiers a year.

Mr. FESS. Would the 550,000 count out exemptions?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes.

Mr. FESS. You mean 550,000 fighting men?

Mr. KAHN. According to the cablegrams that were printed, it means 550,000 men who have been trained and who are now going into the army—trained men trained under the German system.

Mr. FESS. We certainly can beat Germany on numbers.

Mr. KAHN. There is no doubt but that we are going to beat Germany in every way. [Applause.] But the sooner we begin raising armies to do it the quicker we will be able to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I agree with you on that.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as to the status of Senate bill 3426, the commandeering bill, which, I understand, passed the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DENT. What is the title?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The bill is known as the commandeering bill. Its purpose is the taking over by the Government of sawmills, logging camps, logging lands, and the like. I have a telegram from a prominent logging operator in Hoquiam, Wash., which is the center of the spruce industry and where millions of feet of that stock are being gotten out at breakneck speed for aeroplane stock. He telegraphs that Col. Brice P. Disque, who represents the Government in the United States Signal Corps, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg., and who is in complete charge of the spruce production, is greatly hampered for lack of this commandeering law.

Col. Disque, it seems, needs this law in order to take timber from lands of nonresident owners, for commandeering rights of way and the like, and for the cutting of red tape. When I first heard of that bill, which was introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, I felt there would be opposition in the timber country by the timber owners to its far-reaching powers, but I concluded that if Col. Disque needed such a law I would assist in pressing it as a war necessity. This I am prepared to do in spite of its radical features. It pleases me to learn that such men as the author of this telegram, Mr. Polson, are quick to sink any personal objections and to call for action on the part of the House, inasmuch as the Senate has already acted. Therefore I ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama about the present status of the bill.

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman that when that bill passed the Senate and came over to the House it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I took the position that the Committee on Military Affairs did not have jurisdiction of the subject matter. But the Speaker having referred it to us, and nobody seeming to care for it, it was allowed to remain with our committee, but no formal action was taken by the committee, and from the sentiment of the committee I question whether any favorable action will be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am free to say that I thought that the bill would be found in another committee. I desire to ask the gentleman if the bill has been looked upon as a war necessity, or rather, has it been called for by the War Department?

Mr. DENT. We have had absolutely nothing from the War Department in relation to it at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then I take it that the bill is not likely to come soon to the House Calendar. If, however, the committee sees fit at any time to revive the bill, I shall be glad to present the statements of Mr. Polson and others and

to secure a statement in detail from Col. Disque. Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I believe that all of those in authority at the War Department and elsewhere engaged in pressing the war to a successful conclusion are well informed as to the great speeding-up process that has gone steadily for a solid year in the district which I have the honor to represent. Personal differences have disappeared out there. Personal objections to laws which seem drastic are not made. Red tape is quickly cut. Action is the thing. We are delivering the goods. Aberdeen turned over the first Government contract wooden ship in the United States. Hoquiam has furnished spruce stock faster than it could be used. Tacoma gave the site for the largest cantonment, and built it first, cheapest, and best, and the 10 counties in my district were the first in the State of Washington to report their third liberty-loan quota oversubscribed. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman will be reported for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HULL of Iowa offers the following amendment: Page 2, line 16, after the word "act," insert:

"Provided, That those persons registered under the provisions of this act shall be placed at the bottom of the list of those liable for military service in the several classes to which they are assigned, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Is this amendment to be considered as now pending?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent. That was the understanding.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the Speaker said, "Without objection, it will be reported for information."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was an inadvertence.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to take up very much of your time. This amendment explains itself. It seems to me the only fair way to induct these young men into the service is to place them where they naturally come. Unless you do this and the War Department should adopt a proposed plan of its own, this will happen: In some districts there is quite a list of waiting men who have been selected for six or eight months. Their liability to military service has been fixed. The whole community knows where they come in. They are all anxious to go and ready to go. They have had time to prepare themselves. Now you are going to pass a law to bring some young men into the service. Most of these young men are going to school to-day. They know nothing about what we are doing down here, and on the day of registration or a few days before they come to the age of 21. Of course, they come under the provisions of this act. Now, if the War Department adopts its plan, in your district and in my district some of these young men, by chance, of course, will be placed at the head of the list. He will have to drop his school work and go to war before those who have had their liability to military service fixed for nearly 10 months. This is unfair to the young man, and will be so construed by the people back home.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Under this new plan will the liability to service of these young men be determined by drawing out numbered pellets as heretofore?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes. In either case it is only a question as to which plan you take, whether you put these men at the bottom of the list or let them take a chance to come in at the head of the list. I say it is unjust to the men who have already been selected, and it is unjust to the men you are going to select.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. The War Department does not oppose this plan that the gentleman suggests?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. The War Department is not opposed to it, and Gen. Crowder is not opposed to it. However, he has thought of a different plan. I want to read to you his testimony on this very point. It is in the hearings. I asked him:

Mr. HULL. Assuming the bill is passed, would there be any objection on the part of the department to having these boys drawn in at the end of class 1, instead of mixing them in as a whole? It would not change the effectiveness of the law, but it does seem to me it would look a little bit better to the country than it would if you mixed them all in at once.

Gen. CROWDER. I do not know how that would appeal to the country, but I do not see any objection to it.

There are two ways of doing it. Yours is one way and mine is the other. I do not know whether the country would want to follow this new class with any special solicitude and defer their being called until all the men now in class 1 were exhausted or whether they would prefer to see them integrated at once. As the bill is drawn, we can pursue either method, and in the absence of direction by Congress we will consider both methods. I only mention the other way as the way that has commended itself to my judgment. I can not see any special equity in the man who has become 21 years of age since June 5.

Mr. HULL. In all probability, if we did not direct you, you would mix them right in?

Gen. CROWDER. I would go before the Secretary of War and explain it to him and take his direction in regard to it. Just at present I am inclined to favor the direct integrating of the two classes.

Mr. HULL. You would not object to Congress putting these men at the end of class 1?

Gen. CROWDER. No.

So you can see that he is very positive there.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Referring to the statement made by the gentleman a few moments ago about certain individuals in each registration district having been already listed, as he knows, to go if the War Department's plan or Gen. Crowder's should be adopted, is it likely that he would put any of these new registrants in ahead of those who have already been cited to appear?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly. That is his very plan, to have two numbers, one set up of those who have already been listed, and another of these new registrants. And if by chance, as will probably happen, a man in your district is drawn at the head of the list, that young man goes ahead of those who are already listed.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But these men who have already been listed to go have been drawn already?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Now, would not these young men be deferred anyhow until after those who have been listed heretofore have gone?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly not, if Gen. Crowder's plan is adopted. It is the right of this Congress to say which plan they prefer, and now is the time. If you adopt my amendment, that can not happen. It is to prevent this very thing that I advocate its passage.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think the gentleman will agree that the rule is that the older a man is the more useful he is, both to his family and to the community industrially. Now, what is the merit of taking the men all the way up to 31 and sending them first, when they have responsibilities and are useful to their dependents and to the various industries, while saving to the end those who are without responsibilities, and who are not so useful?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Because you have previously selected them. The gentleman's argument would lead to the drafting of boys under 21, in order that we might leave older ones already chosen at home.

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; we limited it to those above 21.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, well, that may come; that is, the drafting of boys under 21.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply desire to ask my colleague if in offering this amendment he does so because he believes it will be the best for the military service of our country, or for the Military Establishment, or if he is prompted in offering this amendment by the solicitude which he may have for certain individuals?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that it is as a military measure I advocate this amendment. To win this war we must, in my opinion, keep the masses of the people enthusiastic for war, and one of the ways to do this is to convince them that we are treating those who must bear the burden fairly in all ways.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. In answering the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] the gentleman said, "Oh, you are in favor of enlisting the men under 21," and then wound up by saying, "Perhaps that will come." Of course the gentleman realizes that we are in war and that we have got to win the war, and if the time should ever come in this country when it will be necessary to take the young men under 21 in order to fill our armies, does the gentleman mean to have it understood that he will refuse to vote for their enrollment?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I certainly shall not when that time comes, but I shall as long as we can find men able to go who are older than that. We should all give heed to the advice of the

War Department, but when in our own opinion they are making a mistake we should fearlessly stand up and call the attention of this representative body to the same. I am willing to make any sacrifice, even to the last drop of our blood, in order to win this war; but I appeal to you to proceed in a decent manner, conserving our strength and manliness in all ways.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Having entered into this subject, which is an interesting one, will the gentleman state if, in his opinion, men older than 21 are by reason of that fact better fitted to perform military service than are young men of 20?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes to answer that question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes additional.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Why does the gentleman oppose training young men of 20, and why does he favor training young men over 21? Is military efficiency promoted by men who are over 21 in preference to those who are only 20?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that I am now opposing training men under 21; that is not the question at all. I simply believe it is better to use older ones, and when you do draft the younger blood put it in where it belongs or treat it as a human being having some rights. Older men are better fighters.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Upon what does the gentleman base that statement?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. On the testimony of men who have been at the front in Europe, that the form of warfare there to-day breaks down young men, that it takes older men to perform it.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I want to ask the gentleman if there has ever been any testimony introduced before our committee in support of the theory that a lot of fellows have got, that boys under 20 are better soldiers than men up to 40?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think there has been some testimony along this line, but it is all mixed up with the question of volunteers so much that I do not care to discuss it.

Mr. GORDON. But nobody proposes to draft minors, except for training, do they?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Not yet.

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to call the attention of the gentlemen here to the fact that unless you adopt this amendment—if the War Department adopts their plan—you in your districts will be appealed to to save some young man for a few months until he can get ready. You will say then that you have not got the power and that you can do nothing. You have the power to-day, and it is a perfectly fair proposition for you to adopt this amendment. The War Department does not object to it. Do not be afraid of what people are saying about you back in your district; stand up and vote your own convictions; it is better to have your own self-esteem and to know that you have tried to do what you considered right in times of stress like these than it is to be reelected. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, on the face of the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] in his amendment to put at the foot of the class the men who will be drawn under the provisions of this resolution as coming of age since the last registration was made, there is a very natural appeal to the sentimental aspects of the subject. On its face it would seem as if that were the fair way to manage the business. If one did not go down below these superficial aspects very deeply it might even carry conviction as a matter of course that the obvious logic of the situation was that the young man who comes in last should be drawn last. It is true, moreover, that the Provost Marshal General has said that it did not make any particular difference to him which way it was done. That, of course, is a very easy statement for the Provost Marshal General to make under the circumstances, inasmuch as Congress having passed a law it is his business to carry out the law in the way it is passed, and in this respect, at least, it really does not make any difference to him. It is also obvious from the statement that was read by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that the Provost Marshal General did have a preferential method which he hopes to carry out. The ultimate effect of either method probably will not be such as to disturb the real military man power that the country will have at any given date, so that in general terms the Provost Marshal General might easily waive it aside for the present, knowing that if it did begin to affect the situation seriously there would be some

way out under military exigency or the power of Congress to give him affirmative authority to make the change. And it is much easier to have this resolution go through and get the boys in anyway than to spend much time in fixing just what should be done with them afterwards.

Now, it seems to me that doing this thing in a practical manner, dismissing for the time being solicitude for the boys when they become 21, dismissing the sentimentality that may attach to it, and coming down to the practical, cold-blooded consideration of the solemn and appalling fact that we are engaged in a life and death struggle of this Nation in the most awful war of recorded history; coming down to that as the premise from which we shall reason, it seems to me that we ought to give the soldiers to the Army with the least possible restrictions on the use to be made of them by the military commanders. It seems to me that we ought to give our soldiers to the country unhampered and unfettered by any needless restrictions as to just when and where and how and in what time they may be used.

It may be argued, as I have suggested, that this is a very small matter; that it simply puts a little farther down the calendar the right to use A as related to the time that B and other men drawn before him are to be used. And yet it is conceivable that under such exigencies as might arise the War Department might want to reach its hand out and gather up any number of men within a certain age, with certain qualifications, that would correspond to particular requisites for military service, and coming down the list find itself obstructed by an apparently innocuous clause inserted in a resolution saying that you can not touch the boys you want to use now until other men you do not want to use have been used before them.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is not the gentleman giving an erroneous construction to this amendment? There is nothing in the amendment that requires them to use men they do not want to use before they use those that they do want.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have not intentionally.

Mr. GORDON. There is nothing in it to prevent their calling the man to-morrow after the man they have drafted before.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman has answered his own question.

Mr. GORDON. If they are in the same class; and ought not that to be done?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman does not see it I have wasted my time. The very purpose of putting these men at the foot of the list is to compel the use of other men before they are called. I say that there should be no needless restrictions on the power of the department to use any man anywhere and at any time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, there is no military question involved in this amendment. It will not affect the number of men that are to be drawn. The Military Establishment will get just as many men under one plan as under the other. It is a question for Congress to decide whether the men of the first draft shall be called before the men of the succeeding drafts shall be called, or whether the men of later drafts shall be integrated into the first draft and taken along with the men of that draft.

I think I violate no confidence when I say that this amendment was a tie vote in committee. There was as much argument in the committee for it as against it.

Here is the proposition that Gen. Crowder said that to his mind would appeal to him, although he did not oppose this one. His plan is to integrate the new classes into the old, and he will give the men of the new draft order numbers the same as he did under the draft of June 5, 1917, except that the order number will be 1 "a," 2 "a," 500 "a," and so on down the line. Then when he draws number 1 of the 1917 register, number 1 "a" of the 1918 register goes in with him. When he draws 500 under the 1917 register he will draw 500 "a" under the 1918 registration, and so on down the line.

If that plan is pursued here is what will happen in some cases. If the war continues three or four years some men of the 1917 registration will still remain uncalled, while some of the 1920 and 1921 registration will be immediately called. I believe it is a good business proposition, and I believe it is best for the Army to draw from the oldest class first. As I have said, it does not affect the number of men, but it makes conditions more satisfactory in the country, and in my opinion the Army more effective. We will know how many men are unexhausted

in class 1. When the new registration is had and they will know from reports how many men are likely to be called, and when the class will be reached, and young men will not be so disturbed in their school courses or in learning their respective trades or professions. They will be permitted oftentimes to complete their education by calling in their stead men who are 25 or 28 or 30 years old. I say it will make conditions more satisfactory in the country, and in my opinion it will be best for the Military Establishment. Some men, both in and out of the Military Establishment, have wanted to fight this war from the start with boys under 21. This bill as reported does not propose that very thing, but it borders close on to it and is a step in the direction of that principle, hence the necessity of this amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the operation of the draft law all those who have become 21 years of age since the last registration, and those taken under the first draft who will be 32 and 33, will still be subject to the draft under the original registration.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this amendment be adopted, would it not result in having men 32 and 33 years of age who are beyond the draft age being called before men who are 21 and 22 years of age, coming under this 1918 registration, would be called, if they fall within class 1?

Mr. FIELDS. Let us take it from that viewpoint. The man who is 31 years of age in class 1 is, generally speaking, unattached.

Mr. BARKLEY. He may not be unattached.

Mr. FIELDS. He is, as a rule, or he would not have been put into class 1. He is under the same obligation to his Government as the man who is 21. Why would it not be better to call him and let the man who is 21, who probably has not completed his education, go ahead and complete his education? Then there is another viewpoint. There is a class of men in the country who are unattached, who drift about from place to place, while the boy 21 years of age is on the farm or at home, as a rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that; but why should we be any more solicitous now of the boy who is just arriving at 21 than we were last year of the boys who then arrived at 21 years of age, and many of whom were called and are now in the Army?

Mr. FIELDS. I make no distinction between them. A man who was 21 on the 6th day of June last year is to-day under the same obligation to his Government as the man who was 21 on the 4th day of June; but as between calling men who are 29 or 30 years of age, and who are in class 1, and men who are 21 years of age and who have not completed their education, I would call the older men, and I think it is fair and right. Then there is another point worth considering. The country will know under my plan exactly what the result will be if we work from the head of the class, utilizing the older registrants first. I believe that any business institution would take that view of it, and I think it will make conditions better throughout the country. I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] will be adopted by the House.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I understand that the desire of those supporting the amendment will be to permit those who are coming 21 to continue their college work. It goes without saying that most of them have finished high-school work, because the high-school age would not extend to 21 years.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I have a little doubt in my mind as to just how effectively a college boy can work after he is put into class 1, and he knows that the draft is likely to take him. I am of opinion that he can not do anything, and he might as well go to the Army at once.

Mr. FIELDS. That does not mean that the boys will quit entering college. They should be given all the advantages that can be given to them, without interfering with the effectiveness of the Military Establishment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it the gentleman's idea that a man who already has those superior social opportunities and benefits in life which enable him to go to college, for instance, shall be put into that other classification not included in Gen. Crowder's questionnaire, "to him that hath to him shall be given," and that he shall be benefited by this thing just because

he is already getting more than 90 per cent of the rest of the boys get normally?

Mr. FIELDS. No. I said a moment ago that the country boy of 21 is on the farm, and if the gentleman wants me to be frank about it I will say that it means much to the agricultural interests of this country to have him remain on the farm as long as possible and to have some definite knowledge if possible as to when his call will come. The adoption of this amendment will produce that result to a great extent.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It also means a good deal to the agriculturists and all others to have a country to work in at all, does it not?

Mr. FIELDS. We should consider the effectiveness of the Military Establishment first, but it does not affect the effectiveness of the Military Establishment whether you select the one plan or the other, except that the plan that I advocate will give to the Army more mature men than will the other plan.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It simply means that you have needlessly tied around the War Department's control of these men some hampering strings, which do not affect the Military Establishment, the gentleman says?

Mr. FIELDS. Not at all. The Military Establishment will have authority to call just as many men under one plan as under the other.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And yet affect the use of the people in it.

Mr. FIELDS. Not at all.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then why tie them on?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any larger proportion of these boys who are 21 on the farm than there are of men in class 1 who are now between 25 and 30 years of age that are on the farm?

Mr. FIELDS. That is my contention, and I think I am correct, because men drift off into public works as they advance in years.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the gentleman will find that the closer a man is to 30, the more settled he is. If he is on a farm, the more likely he is to stay there.

Mr. FIELDS. We know that at first the country child is on the farm, and he is at home, but as he grows older he drifts out into his chosen profession or vocation; therefore the man of 21 who is reared on the farm is more apt to be on the farm than is the man of 30 who is unmarried or unsettled in life.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When we are choosing between men of 30 or 31 and men of 21, is it not fair to conclude that the man who has become 30 years of age and who has not become essential, industrially or socially, who has no family, is a better man to put into the ranks than the boy who is just coming 21 years of age, who has had no opportunity whatever?

Mr. FIELDS. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for raising that question. I intended to allude to it, but I was interrupted. Here is another proposition, from a military point of view: These men who are now 30 years old are growing away from their efficiency; they are growing away from the military service. Suppose the war goes on for 8 or 10 years and you utilize young men in their stead, and 10 years from now they have become incapacitated, in part, by age and the young man, who would be in the prime of life, has been taken to the Army. Would it not be a better business proposition, would it not be a better military proposition, to use the man who is growing out of his military usefulness first? Is it not conserving the military strength of the country to begin at the head of the class and work down? There is no argument on earth against it. The man of 21 has 10 years longer to live, 10 years more of usefulness ahead of him, than the man of 31.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not my colleague favor the proposition of enrolling all men between the ages of 21 and 40?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; I voted for it last year.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not that answer the argument that the gentleman is making?

Mr. FIELDS. But we have not done that; we are dealing with conditions that confront us at this time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FIELDS. I am delighted always to yield to my friend.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thank the gentleman. What is to become—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, now this argument resolves itself into this. The chairman says that Gen. Crowder will do it by regulations if he does not change his mind, but, of course, he changes his mind sometimes. A year ago, with great circumstance and eclat, we had a drawing which was supposed to fix the order in which everybody who was registered should be called into the military service, and did fix that order. Of course it fixed the order of some who did not want to serve and resulted in some friction and objection, and in order to meet that objection the bill was amended in certain respects. I do not intend to discuss that, because I am not going to thrash over ground that we have already passed. I do say that there is no argument that can be made either upon the ground of military efficiency or any other ground, no legitimate argument that can be made against this amendment. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] just stated before he left the floor the men who were registered last year are under the provisions of law liable to render military service whenever called, and those who are unattached or have waived all exemptions are put in class 1, and they are there now, and this proposition would permit under regulations to be adopted any time anybody in the War Department thought best, to defer these men who are in class 1, and put in these boys who have just become 21 years of age. I think the action of the Congress in repudiating the result of the drawing was very unwise, but that has been done. If that drawing, which everybody conceded was the fairest thing connected with the administration of the draft law, had continued in force nobody would seriously have proposed taking these boys who become 21 years old after the registration was had and put them in ahead of anybody older in years who is in the same class. Now, it seems to me for every possible reason that anybody can think of the older man should be taken first because, according to the contention of some gentlemen when a man gets to be 30—and Congress adopted that maximum age limit upon the theory that a man over 30 was not so good for military service as a man under it—if that is true, do you not believe you are conserving the military strength of the country by taking these older men rather than the youngest men you can lay your hands on?

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that theory is correct, why not direct the War Department to take the man of 31 before the man of 30 is taken and to take the man of 30 before the man of 29, and come on down the list of the different classes?

Mr. GORDON. That is the question that was thrashed out when this draft law was enacted. It was thought best not to take men between 21 and 40 for reasons satisfactory to the military authorities, although the proposition to eliminate the age limits of 21 to 40 only got six votes in this House. There were only six men who stood up here and voted for the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to make the age 19 to 25. Of course, the plan at that time was to draft all those between 19 and 25, and the army of the first 1,000,000 men was to be made of boys 19 and 20 years of age. I wonder how many men in the American Congress to-day would be proud to hold up their heads if the 1,000,000 men, or whatever the number is we have over there, were boys of 19 and 20 years of age?

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentlemen's theory is correct and the age limit was from 21 to 40, then we ought to take the man of 40 before we come to the man of 39, and so on down.

Mr. GORDON. Not at all. You take them in the order they were drawn in. They are all equally liable for military service, and the Congress stated that a man between the age of 21 and 30, inclusive, was liable, but the obligation is equal upon all in that classification.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. When the gentleman says the obligation is equal on all men in a class, then why does he give those boys who have become 21 a preferred situation?

Mr. GORDON. Because when we passed the draft law we said they were not liable to military service. We are passing a new law that provides that when they shall have arrived at the minimum military-service age they shall become liable.

Now, if we are doing that, why not allow them to come in in the regular way in which they grow into military service?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In the original allotment men of 21 had to take their chances with men of 31 as to whether they went at the head of the list or not. Why not now?

Mr. GORDON. They do not now. If you had voted with me they would have taken their chances in a drawing of lots, but under the law now and this joint resolution, these boys can be put in ahead of those drafted a year ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have some man point out one logical reason consistent with the votes already cast by this House, against this amendment. There is not any. The only argument I have heard that had any force at all is the statement of the chairman of the committee to the effect that he did not care much about it, because Crowder said he was going to do it anyway. The trouble is, Crowder changes his mind sometimes.

Mr. KAHN. So does the President.

Mr. GORDON. All men do. If anybody can give me one reason against this amendment I will vote against it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Can my colleague give any good reason, from a military standpoint, why these boys that are going to be registered now should be put in a preferred class?

Mr. GORDON. This does not put them in a preferred class. It simply puts them into the military service after the men that we declared a year ago are the men that ought to fight for us. The best military reason I can think of is the reason that actuated you when you voted for the bill to fix the age for military service between 21 and 31. I do not agree that 30 years is the highest point. I think men under 40 are better men to fight than boys under 20. Do not make any mistake about my position. I am talking to men who voted for this draft law which made 30 the maximum age limit, but who want to put boys in now, so that a lot of these fellows will grow out of their military obligation. And I do not want to do that.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will state my question in another way. Can my colleague give any good military reason why these men who are to be registered should not be integrated with those in class 1?

Mr. GORDON. They have not become of the age. This Congress says we ought to impose military service upon them, too, some of them, and I say when they shall become of that age they ought to go in the order in which they are drafted. We drafted the other men a year ago—

Mr. McKENZIE. If my colleague will pardon me, he has not answered my question. What I want to know is, whether you or anyone advocating this amendment can give any good military reason why these boys who have arrived at the age of 21 should not be integrated now with the men now drafted?

Mr. GORDON. I will give you one definite reason and it is this: That the older men are better men for the military service than boys of 21.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Who says so?

Mr. GORDON. I say so. This bill applies to men who are not yet of age.

Now, of course we could stand here and argue all summer about the question of whether men under 40 are better men for soldiers than boys under 20, but I think it is a foolish proposition for any man of common sense to try to argue, especially in a war like this.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This is merely a good-natured suggestion. You do not mean to leave the impression that this bill applies only to men of 21?

Mr. GORDON. It applies to everyone who has reached 21 since June 5, 1917, or may hereafter do so.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. If the men of the older ages in the draft to-day are not as effective as the men of 21, they will still be less effective two or three or four years from now.

Mr. GORDON. Of course they are growing more ineffective all the time as they are getting older.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us take two boys, one who is 21 on the 4th of June and the other one 21 on the 6th day of June.

Mr. GORDON. That is an example of the maxim "De minimis non curat lex."

Mr. BARKLEY. The first was compelled to register; the second did not register. Now, can the gentleman point out any reason in fairness why one of those boys by reason of the difference of two days in their birthdays should be given deferred classification?

Mr. GORDON. No; and this does not give him a deferred classification. Of course, you have got to adopt some arbitrary rule. Congress said it did not propose to draft boys to send to Europe until they were of age. Congress was appealed to for 21 years as a minimum. I think the reasons excellent. Of course, if you are going to split hairs by talking about one that

became 21 before registration day and the other 21 on the day after, that is not practical. The obligation is equal, except that the law made one liable and did not make the other one liable. You have got to adopt some arbitrary rule. What do you say about a man who became 31 on the 4th day of June? The latter is liable under the present law and is a year older than he was then. Why not put him in, then, if he is in class 1? He is drafted and has known it for a year. Congress has imposed this liability and burden upon him. It applies to those boys, every one of them, that have become of age since the 5th of last June, and will apply to everyone in the future who becomes 21 years of age.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened here to my good friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]. The Hull amendment came up in the committee, and I took the view there that I take here, that it could accomplish no good purpose, and that it is nonsensical sentimentality.

We are in a war and a serious war. The resolution that this Congress passed a few days ago provided that all of class 1 throughout the entire Republic should be exhausted before class 2 should be invaded in any bailiwick in the United States. Now, this resolution before the House provides that every young man who has reached the age of 21 years since the 5th day of June, 1917, the registration day, shall at once become subject to the draft law.

And let me animadvert, my friends, for one moment to the proposition that the draft law is now the policy of the Nation. We should lay aside our views as to a volunteer army. My good friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] and myself both entertained those views when we had the original draft law up, but after we were whipped and the Democratic majority on the committee was whipped on the floor of this House, I say, as Democrats and patriots, it is the duty of all of us to stand behind this administration and stand behind the War Department and amend this draft law just as the President and the War Department desire. I shall stand for that throughout the war.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield now.

Mr. FIELDS. * This proposition was not up at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. QUIN. The proposition before us now is to get the most men in class 1 available for service in the Army without in anywise hampering the farms, the industries, and the other productive activities of this Republic during the progress of this great war. How else could it be done, and how better could it be done than to take in this million young men who have become of age since June 5 last and place them in the general pot of the draft, to be called into the Army whenever the Government needs them? No doubt three-fourths of those will be placed in class 1. Those young men without any dependents upon them will be placed in class 1, and why should they be deferred down to the bottom class? All of the men who reach the age of 21 years in this Republic each and all owe the same duty to this Government to go and fight its battles and follow its flag, in France or anywhere else. If they all owe that duty, why is it that the Government should put in a special-privileged class the boy who did not happen to be 21 years of age on June 5, 1917, but who has reached that age since then?

As a military proposition, my friend from Ohio said he would ask any man to assign a single reason against the Hull amendment. I can assign several against it. I say that the law and the Government owes no more right or privilege to any one citizen than it does to another; that a man who is 25 years of age and in class 1 owes no more to this Government than the man who is now 21 years of age; and the War Department wants to put all of them into a general hodgepodge to fill up class 1, so that nowhere will poor men be called away from their families, from their wives and children, so that no man who is really essential on the farm in producing food for the people of this Republic and to maintain our armies shall be taken, so that no man who is essential in the production of ships shall be taken, and—

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. I would love to yield to the gentleman, but I can not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield. Mr. QUIN. So that those I have just mentioned will not be taken away from those industries. And for that reason we need to have a surplus in class 1, that can be drawn from all the time. And, my friends, this is no little matter. This is an important matter. In my judgment, the War Department is exactly right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Can the gentleman from Alabama give me five minutes more?

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if I may.

Mr. DENT. Can the gentleman get along with three minutes?

Mr. QUIN. I will try to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Just for one question.

Mr. QUIN. I would love to yield to my friend, but all I have is three minutes, and I would like to discuss this matter.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will not insist on it, then.

Mr. QUIN. I thank my good friend. [Laughter.] The proposition that the War Department put before our committee and which the committee brought here is for the best military interests of this country. It is for the best industrial interests of this country. It is for the best interests of every farm in this Republic and it is for the best interests of all the people of the United States; and certainly, in my judgment, it is the one thing that we should do to perfect this draft law, so that a hardship will be worked upon no one. The young men who have reached the age of 21 since the 5th of June last year all owe to the Government the same responsibility as the man who is 31, and they can be best spared from the farm and from the industries to go to the fighting line, and obviate the taking away of poor farming and laboring men who have whiskers on their faces and a whole lot of little children around their hearthstones requiring to be fed and clothed. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. This does not propose any more.

Mr. QUIN. The effect of it is that, and my friend from Kentucky knows it is bound to be that. The effect of this resolution—and if any man will analyze it he is bound to see that that will be the result—the effect will be to take the men who have no responsibilities upon them. It would take the men who can be free to go and fight without disturbing home relations, except their fathers and mothers, of course.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it not true that when the first draft was drawn the boy who was then 21 and eligible had to take his chance, whether he would be one of the first drawn in the numbers and go to the head of the list?

Mr. QUIN. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it not fair that these young men should take the same chance?

Mr. QUIN. Certainly.

Mr. GORDON. You have abolished the drawing. They did not take any chance.

Mr. QUIN. We must get an effective army without destroying the industries of this country. Every man in this House knows that from one end of the country to the other the cry came, "Do not take the man off the farm; we must raise food." The War Department, knowing that, asked us to pass this bill, so that they will have a reservoir of men there and that the farmers who are married will be left untouched and will produce the necessary food.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the drawing been abolished?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] three minutes of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the drawing been abolished?

Mr. QUIN. No, sir. The draft law is operating now just as it did when we began. The trouble about it is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] has that sentimental idea running through his mind that you owe more to the boy of 21 years of age than you do the man 25 years of age. I can see that there is some reason for that in sentiment, but when you are in a cyclone you are going to run into the first place of safety.

We are in great danger, and we need this reservoir of young men to draw upon.

Mr. GORDON. Do you think we will get away from this cyclone by taking the men of 21 rather than the men of 31 in the same class?

Mr. QUIN. The man of 31 is going to be taken, like the boy of 21.

Mr. GORDON. No; he is not.

Mr. QUIN. That is what the law provides.

Mr. GORDON. No; that is what our amendment provides—for taking the men of 31 first.

Mr. QUIN. You want to exhaust all of them before you take a single one who has become of age since the 5th of June, 1917. That is nonsense. It can not be for the best interests of this Government. It can not be the military reason. The military reason is to take every man who becomes 21 years of age and place him in the general hotchpotch, to be drawn upon to fight for this country. Who opposes that? When you take a young man 21 years old you do not take a man away from his wife and children but you take a single man without anything to keep him back home, except, of course, his love for his father and mother and brothers and sisters.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Is the gentleman in favor of taking a young man of 21 years of age and depriving him of the opportunity to develop himself, to perfect himself in a trade or profession?

Mr. QUIN. Oh, my goodness, my friend! We can not stop to talk now about developing ourselves in trades. We need men to fight on the western line in Europe. The English are being driven back, the French are being driven back, the Americans are being killed and wounded, and yet we talk here about giving some man time to learn a trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Give me another minute.

Mr. KAHN. I do not want to destroy that peroration, and I will give the gentleman another minute. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Talk about developing, talk about going to school when our flag is about to drag in the dirt! When the Germans, who propose to destroy our civilization and take away our property, our liberties, and our lives, are pushing forward upon us you propose to allow men above 21 years of age to be talking about going to school or sitting around in the parlor. They ought to be willing and ready to go out and follow their flag and go over the top anywhere for this Government. [Applause.] This is no time for us to talk about young men over 21 years old wanting to go to school. Why, we understand that all men would love to be at home. All men would love the opportunities of developing themselves, to become intellectual giants or statesmen or great men in the world's affairs, but the duty they owe their Government is to protect the Nation, so that all, poor and rich, high and low alike, may serve the Government that, in turn, will protect their liberties. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, practically all the battles of this country have been fought by boys under 21. This Congress has decided that the battles of this country hereafter shall be fought by men over 21. There is no particular hurry, then, why we should grab the boy the minute he is 21 and shove him into the firing line. The battle fields of the Republic, from Bunker Hill to Guigneto, are rose red and crimson with the heart's blood of boys 16 to 21. What is the hurry to have them take their turn at bat now when there is a million older in the line that is waiting? Who was it that fought and fell from Gettysburg to Franklin, at Chancellorsville and Vicksburg, at Mission Ridge and Pea Ridge? The volunteer whose heroic figure and immortal fame will live forever, even though you have given him a discharge "without honor." You can see the little volunteer yet.

Out of the focal and foremost fire,
Out of the hospital walls as dre,
Smitten of grapeshot and gangrene,
Eighteenth battle and he sixteen,
Specter such as you seldom see,
Came little Griffin of Tennessee!

The minute he is 21 you want to throw him into the firing line. The gentleman from Illinois asks, Is there any good military reason why men of 31 should not be sent to the firing line before boys of 21? Why, surely. Anybody can tell that. Let us put it on a cold-blooded business basis. If the gentleman wishes. The boy of 21 has 10 years longer to live for the Republic and fight for the Republic, and to be used on the firing line, than the other one. The sensible plan is to preserve him and his 10 extra years—use the one that will last the least time. Why shove him in and get him killed at the same time that the boy of 31 goes in? In a few years the boy of 31 will cease to be useful, and long after that, when he is dead and gone, you can

use the boy of 21. Lose a man of 30 and you lose 20 years. Lose a boy of 21 and you lose 30 years. Conserve him on the same principle that young trees are not cut down. Which is it that you strike down, the monarch of the forest or the little sapling? Why, the question answers itself.

The gentleman and soldier from Vermont stated it very aptly when he said that, in the first place, if you thought about it of course it seemed natural that you should let the boy of 21 wait; that, in effect, anybody of any sense of course would naturally expect to keep the boy of 21 until the last. And then he proceeded to argue the seal off the bond, a thing which he is mighty handy at doing. He can always give a good reason for anything. I marveled at his ability as a debater to tell why we should not take them. But suppose you were a man of 31 on the firing line, and suppose you had a brother of 21 on the firing line with you. Suppose they called for volunteers for a forlorn hope, which of you would go? If you were any man at all, you would go and send your mother's younger boy back to wait until the next time. That is what this Republic expects these men to do. It expects that the men of 31 will go first to the firing line, while it conserves the young strength of the youth of the Republic, which will last longer. Of course that is the sensible thing to do. There are enough boys of 16 to 21 lying in their graves who fought for the Republic and died for the Republic before they became of age and before they could have any mature judgment. Why should not the men of 21, who could vote when war was declared, and the men up to 31 go before the boys of 19 and 20, who did not have anything to say about it? There is plenty of patriotism in this Republic, and half the boys of 16 to 21 would be in the Army now if you would let them. You know that an army of volunteers would be full of boys. You voted against it. The men of 31 are patriotic. They have sound judgment and good sense, and they do their duty when you ask them, and they will want you to conserve our resources in the natural way, as the gentleman from Vermont suggested.

I have a matter in that connection to which I want to call your attention. There is plenty of patriotism in this country. Thank God, the American Republic is sound to the core and practically all of its citizens are loyal citizens. Ninety-five per cent of the Croatians in Kansas City, Kans., have bought liberty bonds, I learned to-day. I find a very curious thing here. It seems we have not even got to depend upon the boys of 19 or 20. We have agitated the woman question so much that we have gotten a response. It seems that the English send the boys into the firing line and appoint young women as army field clerks, from the letter I shall read.

I made a little talk here on the 9th of March as to the difference between men who go out and fight for their country and men who wear uniforms in the departments. Here is a letter from Miss Blanche A. O'Connor, who is in the department Judge Advocate's office in Chicago. I thought uniforms and shoulder straps were for fighting men, not for civilians with no military training doing civilian's work. That men in uniforms and shoulder straps should share the dangers of their comrades if they shared their honors. Yesterday the National Association of the Daughters of 1812 resolved to put no star on the service flag except for those who risk their lives or propose to risk their lives for their country. Miss O'Connor is of their opinion.

She refers to my talk in the House March 9, and says:

CHICAGO, March 29, 1918.

HON. E. C. LITTLE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read with a great deal of interest your discussion in a recent issue of the Army and Navy Gazette, and was particularly impressed with the following statement:

"The principal business of the American Army is to win the war. This war is not going to be won in Washington. * * * It is going to be won on the firing line. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see an order made to-morrow that every man with a uniform on in Washington be sent to the front, where they ought to be. This is not a place for soldiers."

As a woman Army field clerk, I also believe that the war can not be won in Chicago, and am taking the liberty of asking your good offices, in behalf of women Army field clerks for the following reasons:

In August, 1917, I was sworn in as a temporary Army field clerk to serve for the period of the war. I have been admitted to the Illinois bar three years, but being an experienced stenographer I desired to serve my country in some way. At that time the colonel judge advocate in charge believed that the place of men was in the field, and consequently women were employed in the office. Since that time three women have resigned and their places have been filled by young men within draft age. These young men were holding good positions when they were employed as Army field clerks, but I did not think it would be tactful or discreet, on my part, to say why I think they left civilian life to enter the service in this way. The fact remains that we have a large number of Army field clerks in Chicago in officers' uniforms— young men within draft age. Their status is between that of an officer and an enlisted man. Their duties are purely clerical, and are such as can be performed by a woman, and in most instances better.

I would welcome an assignment to foreign service, as doubtless many other women now in the service would. I am equipped, I believe, both mentally and physically, for the work, and have a fairly accurate knowledge of the French language. Up to this time, however, the War Department has detailed only men in this capacity for overseas service. The woman Army field clerk has a military status, and to assign them to foreign service, particularly in the branch offices of the Army, would not be an untried experiment as to the fitness and capability of women, as is borne out by the fact that women are detailed in the Army and Navy Female Nurse Corps; the Surgeon General has made a recent ruling that women may be employed as bacteriologists and laboratory assistants; Gen. Pershing has called for contingents of telephone operators, and the branch offices of our Army in France, I believe, already have employed French women. All these units of women have been, and are now being, assigned to duties far more dangerous than would be the work of an Army field clerk. The morale of the Army has also been enhanced by the employment of women, as can be seen by the work of the women's canteen committee, Salvation Army, and other units, which have been working in the war zone.

The work which I am doing here in the central department could easily be filled by a woman who is a cripple or who has obligations which would prevent her from going to the front, and as my father served four years in the Confederate Army, and my mother saw four brothers volunteer in the Union ranks, I am necessarily of the opinion that every American young woman, physically able and who has had training in the military offices, should be sent to the front in the same manner as the women in England are employed, and more particularly at this critical time when men are so badly needed in the combatant forces.

Assuring you that I should, indeed, appreciate an indorsement on your part of the advisability of the employment of women Army field clerks in foreign service that I may leave the patriotic young men in this office "alone in their glory," "to pursue the even tenor of their ways," I remain,

Very respectfully, yours,

BLANCHE A. O'CONNOR.

CHICAGO, April 7, 1918.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LITTLE: I wish to thank you for your letter of April 2, and its kind expressions on my behalf.

I am glad to inclose an affidavit as to my service in the War Department of the United States Army, acknowledgment by The Adjutant General of the Army of my application for foreign service, and also copy of telegram appointing me from the civil-service list of lawyers to the position of law clerk in Washington. I have, however, declined the appointment, believing that the place of every American woman, with the requisite qualifications in the military service, is at the front, that no one may accuse her of not heeding the Biblical admonition of "Whosoever has set his hand to the plow, and turning back, is not fit to enter the Kingdom."

You will note that at the time my application was made some two months ago the department did not contemplate assigning women to duty in France. That they are employed almost exclusively in the base armies of the allies, more particularly England, would seem to be one of the logical reasons to be advanced for their being assigned by the United States Government.

Again assuring you of my appreciation of your efforts in behalf of women Army field clerks for their appointment to over-seas service, and of my utmost confidence in the outcome, I am

Very respectfully, yours,

BLANCHE A. O'CONNOR.

Mr. Speaker, there are in the departments many young men who would be glad to be relieved from the monotony of department work even if in uniform and proud of an opportunity to go to the front as their brothers and fathers and grandfathers before them. If there be those there who are reluctant; if there be those who are satisfied to work in bomb-proof safety, the newspapers have announced, since March 9, that the Chief of Staff has said men who were seeking to evade actual service and men who can well be spared would soon be sent from Washington. The young lady from Chicago in this letter I lay before the House suggests the plan by which the one can be spared and the other's wish be granted. She tells us that the English have women Army field clerks. She appears as the first volunteer for that service in the American Army, the sister in arms of those admirable nurses who have made so sweet and so gallant a record with our troops on a thousand fields. As she sensibly suggests, clerical work can be done here and at the front by women as well as by men, and every soldier can be spared for the shock of war. That her name is O'Connor is somewhat significant; that name is not unknown in the annals of war.

Already, gentlemen, all our young men hear the summons to the field, and our old men the rumble of the guns they have heard before. The call has been heard in the hearts of their sisters, and this letter spread on your records will tell the world for a thousand years that our people stand shoulder to shoulder to stake the last dollar, the last man, and the last woman that this mightiest Republic shall conquer or perish for those principles of equity and liberty which are the corner stones of human rights and a Christian civilization. Mr. Speaker, I want the House and the world to know that the women are ready to go to the front. Let the Huns take notice they fight a united Nation as in the brave days of old. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California, but before doing that I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his courtesy in yielding me this time, but the subject I desire to speak upon would take more than

five minutes. I wish to talk seriously on the question of the preservation of the dead bodies of our soldiers. I have some data on that subject that I would like to present. I realize that this bill ought to be passed, and am in sympathy with the gentleman in charge of the bill in urging and hastening its passage. Therefore I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to this discussion. I am prepared to vote, so far as I am concerned, and do not know that I can make any statement that will cause anybody to vote as I do. I have constituents that will come in the 21-year-old class and some in the 31-year-old class, and all the way between. I think I shall vote for this amendment, and for this reason: Class 1a is the first to be called, and then you can take all the way through class 1. I am not an expert in military affairs, but all of them, I take it, are to be drawn before you come to class 2.

There are several classes that are exempt. For instance, if a man is unmarried and has dependents he is exempt. If a man is married, under certain conditions—and he is apt to be dependent unless he is awfully well heeled; then there are certain callings that are exempt, certain portions of the farmers, mechanics, and so on, as I understand it, and I wish to be corrected if I am wrong. Now, the man that is exempt, and if in class a 1, 2, 3, and 4, is a man that does not have any dependents and does not come in as a farmer or a mechanic and be exempt on that account. If he is healthy and passes the doctor, does not have dependents at all, is not exempt, I do not see why that man should not be called before the boy that is 21 years old on the 3d of June next, if that is the date.

That is all I want to say about it, therefore I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman does not mean to assume that all married men who have families dependent upon them are exempt?

Mr. GORDON. They are if they claim it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; nothing like it.

Mr. CANNON. If they have dependents they are substantially exempt. I said that I was not an expert touching military affairs, but I apprehend that if they have dependents they are exempt. Anyway I am willing to let the boy that becomes 21 early in June next, if he is called—and class 1 will not be called for a year—I am willing that he shall have that additional year either to go to school or work on the farm or otherwise. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORIN].

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor of this House and by the newspapers throughout the country in relation to the number of commissioned officers on duty in the departments here in Washington, and I believe that there is a misunderstanding both among the Members of this House and the people of the country as to the actual number and class of officers that are on duty here.

Those statements have placed all these officers who are compelled to remain here on duty under the embarrassment of being in the class of slackers or of having been taken from civil life through political influence and given commissions for the purpose of avoiding military service in the field.

Such statements, I believe, are unfair and unjust to the brave, patriotic, and highly efficient officers who are compelled, much against their own will, to remain here in order to perform the important duties to which they have been assigned. So in order to have the correct information for the Members of the House and place these officers in the proper light before the people of the country, I requested Adjutant McCain for a statement of the number of men and the branch of the Army to which they are attached, which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 26, 1918.

Hon. JOHN M. MORIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In response to your recent request for information relative to commissioned officers who have been assigned to duty in Washington in connection with the work of the various staff corps and departments, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

There has apparently been considerable misapprehension regarding both the kind of work performed by officers on staff duty and the number of them detailed in Washington. The public in general seems to be under the impression that staff duty and purely clerical duty are one and the same thing and that the work could be performed as well by a civilian as by

a commissioned officer; in short, that a staff officer is nothing other than a clerk in uniform. Moreover, the number of officers on duty in Washington is generally believed to be much larger than it really is, owing to the temporary presence here of officers making personal reports to the department or on furlough from near-by camps and also, perhaps, because the novelty of the sight of an officer's uniform has not yet worn off and an exaggerated notion as to their number results.

The following figures have been compiled to show the total number of commissioned officers in the various staff corps and departments of the Army on March 23, 1918, and the number of these who were detailed for duty in Washington:

	Total.	On duty in Washington.
General Staff.....	165	79
Adjutant General's Department.....	331	47
Inspector General's Department.....	105	26
Quartermaster Corps.....	6,628	603
Engineer Corps.....	5,807	332
Ordnance Department.....	4,284	1,880
Signal Corps:		
1 and Section.....	1,511	91
Aviation Section.....	8,825	525
Medical Corps.....	124,425	534
Dental Corps.....	15,628	13
Veterinary Corps.....	11,803	15
Judge Advocate General's Department.....	165	42
Militia Bureau.....	7	7
Bureau of Insular Affairs.....	3	3
Chaplains.....	662
Professors, Military Academy.....	7
Director of Civilian Marksmanship.....	1	1
Total.....	60,357	4,198

Only 16,979 commissioned officers of the Medical Corps, 1,814 of the Dental Corps, and 185 of the Veterinary Corps were on active duty March 23, 1918.

Of the total of 60,357 officers included in this summary it will be observed that 32,690, or over one-half, are in the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, in the Judge Advocate General's Department, professors at the United States Military Academy, and chaplains. Included in the list are also the executive chiefs of the various staff corps and departments and the officers of long military experience who act as their assistants and advisers. It certainly can not be held that the duties of these trained soldiers, physicians, dentists, lawyers, clergymen, etc., are susceptible of being performed by civilian clerks.

The Signal Corps is also included in the above summary as part of the staff of the Army, but the greater part of its commissioned personnel of 10,336 officers will eventually see active duty of the most dangerous character. A similar statement is applicable also in the case of the 5,807 officers of the Engineer Corps, which corps, it should be stated, is properly part of the line of the Army and not of the staff.

The present war has developed into a war of specialists. History affords us no precedent of the sort, and the presence in the armies of to-day of considerable numbers of highly trained specialists in mechanical, chemical, and other technical and scientific lines has become an absolute necessity. A considerable proportion of the balance of the number shown above is made up of these, notably in the cases of the Ordnance Department and the Quartermaster Corps.

In the comparatively few cases where Army officers are performing duties of a strictly clerical nature, it is to be observed that the work required of them is so highly confidential and demands such long hours that it has been deemed to be in the best interests of the service to place it in the hands of men amenable to military discipline. There is also a very limited number of instances of commissions having been granted to men of high standing in the business world and trained experts in their particular lines, who responded patriotically to the Government's appeal with a tender of their services. The services of these men are of great value to the department, and the granting to them of commissions in the Army in return therefor appeared to be the only adequate way of meeting their cases.

As shown above, there were, on the 23d instant, 4,198 staff officers actually on duty in Washington. The larger part of this number is made up of officers on purely temporary duty. The number varies considerably from day to day; but even though a month from now exactly the same number were still on duty here, this would not necessarily mean that it was still made up of the same individuals, for the personnel is constantly changing. An officer on duty in Washington to-day may to-morrow receive orders to proceed to Europe and his place here will be filled by another.

At the time the United States became involved in the war the number of commissioned officers in the Army, including the National Guard then in Federal service, was 9,524, while at the present time there is a total of approximately 128,000. In view of this tremendous increase it is but natural that the number of officers on duty in Washington should likewise have been greatly augmented. This increase in the commissioned strength of the Army had to be effected in the shortest possible time, and it is perfectly natural that some mistakes were made and commissions given in some cases to applicants who would not have received them had the time for determining their qualifications been more ample. As soon as an error of this sort becomes apparent, it is rectified, and whenever the department's attention is called to a specific case an investigation is immediately ordered. In line with this policy a considerable number of officers in the Medical Corps have recently been discharged from service, which accounts for the apparent discrepancy between the figures now furnished and those which I gave out about two months ago.

In conclusion, it is only just to those officers who are detailed to duty in Washington to state, in their behalf, that the assignment was not of their own choosing, and that there are few amongst them who would not welcome the receipt of orders transferring them to duty at the front. With the exception of those amongst them who hold commissions in the Medical and Dental Corps, they are not noncombatants, as seems to be generally believed, but will be called upon to perform regular duty with troops and will all, from time to time, as occasion arises, be ordered to the front.

Very respectfully,

H. P. McCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the gentleman from Mississippi inquiring whether or not he was in favor of having boys who have just attained maturity called immediately into the service and permit those who are already in the draft, men of more mature years who have no obligations or dependents, who have no profession or trades, to avoid service for some time to come, while the young man of 21 would be immediately pressed into service and the opportunity denied him of continuing his education, developing a profession, or learning a trade.

Had he answered my interrogatory I would not have inflicted myself upon this body, because of the limited time, and I want the chairman of the committee to know that I am grateful for the opportunity given me to say a few words.

The military authorities are willing, if this body so directs, that they call all who are in class 1 before mustering into service these young men who have attained the age of 21 years since May 18, 1917. Therefore, gentlemen, if we pass this amendment we will not in any way hamper or disturb the military authorities. Nothing in the world could induce me at this time, when the life of our Nation is in the balance, to handicap or embarrass the military authorities. I feel, like the gentleman from California, that if the time comes for the successful prosecution of this war if necessary we will call into service all boys from 18 and up, call on all Americans who are physically able to do battle to annihilate the Hun and to establish the principles of democracy, but until that time comes I favor this amendment and am unalterably opposed to taking the young man who has just reached 21 years of age, deprive him of higher education, a chance of advancement, and probably destroy his future career.

If this law is passed the young man will recognize that if the war continues he must eventually be called into service. He will have an opportunity during spare time to prepare himself in a military way, probably in his home town, by joining some military company that drill and prepare themselves in the evening and still the opportunity will be given him during the day to continue his studies.

It has been suggested that there should be no sentiment involved, which is true, because this is a practical question, a question of life and death, but it is absolutely impossible to eliminate sentiment from the hearts of the parents who are giving that which they hold most sacred in the world to their Government, and if, my friends, in this amendment we can alleviate the pain and anguish of the parents of these boys, help assuage their grief without working any hardship or disadvantage to the military authorities, I think their feelings should be taken into consideration.

I believe, and I think the majority of the Members of this House feel, that it is unjust to the young man of 21 to permit the military authorities at this time to call him into service until class 1 has been exhausted.

I believe, gentlemen, these young men should be given an opportunity to develop themselves physically and mentally until class 1 has been called into service.

I favor giving money, soldiers, ships, guns, shells, and whatever else necessary to win this war. I favor any just and honorable solution that will bring this conflict to a speedy and victorious termination, and I hold that the passage of this amendment will in no way retard our victory, which is inevitable.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that was made the other day that there were 62,000 commissioned officers in the noncombatant service and a little over that number in the active fighting line was a startling statement to me. I had never taken notice of the requirements of this branch of the service. The discussion has created a great deal of interest that is manifesting itself in a great deal of correspondence. I have had letters from men in the camps which comment upon the situation. Interested in the statement, I sought an interview with one of the officers here in the city with whom I am very well acquainted, and who is identified with a certain activity in the War Department which enables him to speak with authority. I desired to know why we had so many of the "safety-first" men, as they were stigmatized, and how many could be called slackers. He told me last night that this was a great injustice to the men—that the great majority were here by order and would prefer service in the field. He informed me that in his own division he had offered as a sort of premium the promise that he would recommend the officers under his charge for service overseas, provided they reached a certain stage of efficiency. His experience with the men

convinced him that such a prospect would insure a higher degree of service. He said that was the one persuasive, effective promise that he had made, which had resulted in greater efficiency. He also said the stigma of "swivel-chair" soldiers had produced such dissatisfaction among the men that a distinct demoralization had been observed throughout his division.

In another division there was a canvass made as to the number who would like to go overseas, and he told me that 100 per cent reported that they wanted over-sea service. It is significant that this canvass was made before the criticism was made here on the floor. This officer was broken in spirit in that he said that this criticism had so demoralized the morale of the men under him that they had come to a state of mind where they seemed to have no heart in the work here and demanded they be given a chance to go out into the service in the field away from Washington. He also made the statement that at least 50 per cent of those who are here, at least in his division, have been picked out of the camps and ordered here without their own consent. They had been selected on the basis of their record in the camps and were here under orders. They are fretful and insist upon getting from under this criticism which they declare is unjust to them, and they demand that in justice to themselves the criticism ought to be specific and not applied indiscriminately.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. My colleague on the committee, Mr. MORRIS, has just inserted in the Record a letter from The Adjutant General showing that there are only 4,000 of those young officers here in Washington, while the general impression is that there are 15,000 or 20,000 of them.

Mr. FESS. I think that will correct an error also. Many will read the figures used in the criticism as confined to the men in Washington. I have no doubt there are men here in uniform with commissions who have no right to wear them if judged from their merit. No doubt undue influence has been brought to bear upon those in authority to secure preferment. Indeed, my informant assured me there were. He said the staff would be glad, if called upon, to name quietly persons who could be dispensed with, and intimated that congressional influence had been employed to place these men. That such is the case may easily be conceived, and criticism to that degree should be allowed, but it ought to be specific.

Mr. Speaker, just a half moment to say that I think this general criticism is unfair to these men, and there ought to be some caution about these charges. Under modern warfare the number back of the line is not far from that on the line. It seems incredible, but that is the statement of authorities based upon experience in Europe. Then again, these men especially selected for this noncombatant service, where selected by Army and Navy authorities without outside influence, were chosen because of their fitness as displayed in civil life. It is quite apparent that caution was and must be counseled. I agree that where it can be done all the clerical work should be done by those not in draft age. It should especially be guarded against allowing anyone of influence to secure a place for anyone who desires to shirk military duty. This should be the purpose of us all. But it is unfair to the great number of commissioned men here to place them in such a class. In behalf of that group I hope those who make these statements will note the terrible effect in demoralizing our ability to be 100 per cent effective.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, in the first place I hope that all of the committee amendments will be adopted. The committee considered the resolution very carefully, and was practically unanimous upon all the amendments that have been reported as committee amendments.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I have only five minutes, but I yield to the gentleman. I want to speak on the Hull amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just finished a statement in which I am interested and from which I infer that he is opposed to any interference with the officers who have been called from civil life and given commissions without any military training or experience. Does the gentleman from California think it is right that these men should be called from civil life and given these so-called "safety-zone" positions without any preparation whatever of a military character, and that men from the trenches who happen to meet them must salute them as their superiors? I am asking for information.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, that question will take me away from the discussion of this resolution which I have been very anxious to discuss. To answer it fully would take more time than I have at my disposal, but I will briefly answer the gentleman. I recognize the fact that the Army of the United States has been

enormously expanded. I recognize the fact that experts are necessary in ordnance, in the Quartermaster's Department, in the Signal Corps, and in many branches of the Military Establishment, especially in the staff departments. Many of the men who fill the technical positions in the ordnance, for instance, are graduates of universities who are scientists; they are needed in the manufacture of powder, in making gas bombs, and in all of those activities in ordnance which are necessary for the winning of the war. At the very beginning many of these young men probably offered their services and showed their special aptitude in those lines. They were given commissions. That is how many of them were commissioned. Now, I will extend my remarks further, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope the gentleman will correct the statement that these men are all college graduates.

Mr. KAHN. I did not intend to say they were all college graduates.

Mr. FARR. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. KAHN. One moment. I want simply to say this about the pending matter. I do not think it is all important whether the Hull amendment be adopted or rejected. But I recognize the fact that we are in war; that we are in a desperate war and will need millions of men—perhaps many more millions than any of us feel at this time the country will be called upon to supply. Then why should we want to tie the hands of the War Department, which will have to furnish these armies? Why should we lay down to them a hard and fast rule under a law of Congress when in the emergencies that may arise during the continuation of the war the time may come when it will be advisable for the department to use its discretion and do that which is best for the country? That is why I shall not vote for the Hull amendment.

A great deal has been said here about young men 21 years of age. Do you not recognize the fact that in our Army to-day we probably have hundreds of thousands of young men who volunteered at 18 years of age? They are on the other side now, fighting for their country. Do you want to pull them out of the Army because they volunteered? According to the logic of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] and some of the other gentlemen who have spoken for the Hull amendment, the War Department should begin the draft first with those who are 31, then those who are 30, then those who are 29, and so on, until they come to the youngest on the list—those who are 21. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments, and then I shall ask for a vote on this resolution. The proposition presented by the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] I shall vote against for the simple reason, as given by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], that it is a matter that should be left to regulation rather than to strict statutory law. I am informed by some members of the Provost Marshal General's Office that the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be carried into effect by the War Department unless something happens that will necessitate a change in their minds. I think, therefore, this should be a matter that should be left to regulation rather than to the strict language of a statutory enactment. Now, one other question, Mr. Speaker, and I shall ask for a vote. Nothing has been said in this debate about the action of the committee in striking out the Senate amendment exempting theological and medical students. The committee thought that in registering young men coming of age that there ought to be no exemption. The committee was practically unanimous upon that proposition. It was urged that if we adopt the action of the Military Committee of the House that we will interfere with the education of young men studying for the ministry and the practice of medicine. That same proposition, so far as medical students are concerned, was presented when the original draft law was up last year, and both houses finally agreed to strike out the exemption in behalf of medical students. The President has absolute power as Commander in Chief of the Army to take care of medical students and theological students if this draft should so interfere with them as to affect the number of young men in those two professions.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I would like to finish this.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman explain why he omitted from this bill the exemption of medical students and students of divinity, whereas in section 4 of the draft law it says there shall be an exception in their favor. Now the gentleman's committee has stricken out that exception in this bill. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit, I can explain that. The exemptions are of those students who are already in the colleges, but this would exempt those who have gone into colleges since the last draft.

Mr. ROBBINS. Proposes to exempt them?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. ROBBINS. Why are they not entitled to exemption as much as the others?

Mr. DENT. I did not yield for any colloquy. The gentleman from California has exactly explained the matter. The language of section 1 to which attention is called applies to the law as it was passed May 18, and, as the gentleman from California says, the other would extend the provisions of that law to the young men who have become 21 years of age since the 5th day of last June. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one further thing upon this proposition, that if you leave the bill as it comes from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, I repeat, the President of the United States can take care of the situation just as he did with the medical students under the present law. Besides that, under this law it is not intended and is not contemplated, as some gentlemen fear, that amendment will materially interfere with these students. It is not contemplated that every young man who is preparing for the ministry or for the medical profession shall be taken by the draft. There will be many of them who will not be taken. I think we ought to have a uniform law without any exemptions whatever and leave it to the Commander in Chief of the Army to take care of whatever situation that may arise. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on page 3, on the proviso in reference to the two classes—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other committee amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think in the ordinary procedure the amendments are voted on seriatim as they occur in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is true, but it occurred to the Chair there would be no objection to voting on those amendments en bloc on which a separate vote is not demanded.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think that is contemplated by the rule. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know of any rule prohibiting the adoption of amendments by unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH. I think the rule provides in the Committee of the Whole the amendments shall be voted on as they occur in the bill. This is not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Providing you put the question and the vote should be negative would there be any further vote on any other separate amendment, or all be defeated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All defeated.

Mr. LITTLE. Then I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas objects, and the Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert the words "during the present emergency."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "States," strike out the word "or" and insert "and all male persons."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "as," strike out the words "in said proclamation may be exempted from registration," and insert in lieu thereof "are exempt from registration under the act of May 18, 1917, and any act or acts amendatory thereof."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "of," strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "said."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after the words "United States," strike out the word "or" and insert "and all male persons."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "as," strike out the words "in the proclamation by the President stating the time and place of such registration may be exempted from registration," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "are exempt from registration under the act of May 18, 1917, and any act or acts amendatory thereof."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 7, after the word "act," strike out the proviso down to and including the word "President," in line 19.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, that is not the proper way to report that amendment.

The Clerk reported the amendment, as follows:

Strike out the proviso, as follows:

"Provided, That students who are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools, and students who are preparing for the practice of medicine and surgery in recognized medical schools, at the time of the approval of this act shall be exempt from the selective draft prescribed in the act of May 18, 1917; and that students entering such theological or divinity schools after the approval of this act and during the continuance of the war, and who would be subject to any future registration as provided for in this act, may upon the recommendation or request of the president or dean of such school be exempt from the selective draft by order of the President."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I rise to ask for a division of the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The amendment relates to two classes of students, one theological students and the other medical students. The suggestion I make is that in line 9 the amendment be voted on with these words out:

And students who are preparing for the practice of medicine and surgery in recognized medical schools.

Now, I ask for a vote on the amendment with that language out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, if the question is going to be divided, I ask unanimous consent that the vote first be taken on that clause of the amendment exempting medical students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the vote first be taken on the provision exempting medical students.

Mr. FESS. Any Member can demand a division, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member can demand a division. The Chair was simply putting the request of the gentleman from Alabama for unanimous consent that the vote first be taken on striking out the provision excepting medical students. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBBINS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will that prevent us from having a separate vote on the exclusion of students of divinity?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the portion of the amendment striking students of medical schools out of the committee amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The effect of that will be, if the motion prevails, to exempt medical students?

Mr. GORDON. No; just the opposite.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Just the reverse. The Clerk will report the amendment as it would exist in case the request of the gentleman from Alabama is adhered to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, after the word "act," strike out the following:

"Provided, That students who are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools at the time of the approval of this act shall be exempt from the selective draft prescribed in the act of May 18, 1917; and that students entering such theological or divinity schools after the approval of this act and during the continuance of the war, and who would be subject to any future registration as provided for in this act, may, upon the recommendation or request of the president or dean of such school, be exempt from the selective draft by order of the President."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] wanted a vote first on the language with medical students left in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. He was reporting it as it would read with medical students stricken out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought he was reporting it as it was up to that point.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKENZIE. A vote "aye" on this proposition as now reported by the Clerk means to sustain the action of the Committee on Military Affairs, does it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the way the Chair understands it.

Mr. FESS. I think there is confusion here. If we divide the amendment and vote separately, first on one part of the division and secondly on the other part, the regular procedure would be to vote down the part we want to retain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has got unanimous consent to take up the part relating to medical students first. Now will the gentleman from Alabama make a motion so that the Chair may place it before the House as he understands it?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the language that is to be stricken out be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair just had the Clerk read the amendment with the language left out, as he understood it. Without objection, the language to be stricken out will now be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "schools," strike out the following: "and students" who are preparing for the practice of medicine and surgery in recognized medical schools."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Do I understand that the language just read by the Clerk—that is, "students who are preparing for the practice of medicine and surgery in recognized medical schools"—has been stricken out?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That has been stricken out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And a "yea" vote now would be to retain the rest of it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. Having already stricken out the medical students, now the question is whether you would strike out the divinity students. The question is now on the amendment to strike out the language indicated.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 101, noes 2.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll. The Doorkeeper will close the doors.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendment striking out this language will answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 29, answered "present" 3, not voting 136, as follows:

YEAS—262.

Alexander	Browning	Cooper, W. Va.	Elliott
Almon	Brumbaugh	Cooper, Wis.	Ellsworth
Anderson	Buchanan	Cox	Esch
Anthony	Burrongs	Crago	Fairchild, B. L.
Ashbrook	Butler	Crisp	Fairfield
Aswell	Byrnes, S. C.	Currie, Mich.	Farr
Ayres	Byrns, Tenn.	Dallinger	Ferris
Bacharach	Campbell, Kans.	Darrow	Fess
Baer	Candler, Miss.	Davidson	Fields
Bankhead	Cannon	Davis	Fisher
Barkley	Cantrill	Dent	Flood
Barnhart	Caraway	Denton	Focht
Beakes	Carlin	Dickinson	Fordney
Bell	Carter, Mass.	Dies	Foster
Black	Carter, Okla.	Dill	Francis
Blackmon	Chandler, Okla.	Dillon	Frear
Bland	Church	Dixon	French
Blanton	Clark, Fla.	Doollittle	Fuller, Ill.
Booher	Classton	Doremus	Fuller, Mass.
Borland	Claypool	Doughton	Gandy
Bowers	Cleary	Dowell	Gard
Brand	Collier	Dunn	Garland
Britten	Connally, Tex.	Eagle	Garner
Browne	Connelly, Kans.	Edmonds	Garrett, Tex.

Gillett	Lea, Cal.	Peters	Stephens, Miss.
Glynn	Lehlbach	Pou	Sterling, Ill.
Good	Leshner	Purnell	Stevenson
Goodwin, Ark.	Lever	Quin	Stiness
Gordon	Little	Ragsdale	Sweet
Green, Iowa	Lobeck	Raker	Taylor, Ark.
Greene, Vt.	Longworth	Ramsey	Taylor, Colo.
Hadley	Lufkin	Ramsayer	Temple
Hamilton, Mich.	Lundeen	Rayburn	Thomas
Hamlin	McArthur	Reavis	Tillman
Hardy	McClintic	Reed	Timberlake
Haskell	McCulloch	Roberts	Towner
Hastings	McKenzie	Robinson	Treadway
Haugen	McKinley	Rogers	Van Dyke
Hawley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Romjue	Vestal
Hayden	McLemore	Rose	Vinson
Hayes	Madden	Rouse	Volstead
Heflin	Magee	Rowe	Waldow
Helm	Mansfield	Rubey	Walker
Helvering	Mapes	Russell	Walsh
Hensley	Mayes	Sabath	Walton
Hersey	Miller, Minn.	Sanders, Ind.	Ward
Holland	Miller, Wash.	Sanders, N. Y.	Watson
Hollingsworth	Mondell	Saunders, Va.	Watkins
Houston	Montague	Schall	Weaver
Huddleston	Moon	Scott, Mich.	Webb
Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Pa.	Sears	Welty
Humphreys	Morgan	Shallenberger	Wheeler
Hutchinson	Morin	Sherley	White, Me.
Ireland	Neely	Sherwood	White, Ohio
Johnson, Wash.	Nicholls, S. C.	Sims	Williams
Kahn	Nolan	Sinnott	Willson, La.
Keboe	Oldfield	Sisson	Wilson, Tex.
Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.	Slayden	Wingo
Kennedy, Iowa	Oliver, N. Y.	Sloan	Wise
Kiess, Pa.	Osborne	Small	Wood, Ind.
Kinkaid	Overmyer	Smith, Idaho	Woods, Iowa
Kitchin	Overstreet	Smith, Mich.	Woodyard
Knutson	Padgett	Snook	Young, N. Dak.
Kraus	Paige	Stagall	Young, Tex.
La Follette	Park	Stedman	
Langley	Parker, N. Y.		

NAYS—29.

Cary	Greene, Mass.	Linthicum	Riordan
Coady	Hilliard	Loneragan	Robbins
Delaney	Igoe	Maher	Tague
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Mason	Watson, Va.
Donovan	Keating	Moore, Ind.	Whaley
Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Shaunessy	
Gallivan	Kincheloe	Phelan	
Graham, Ill.	Lazaro	Rainey, J. W.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

London	McAndrews	Rodenberg
--------	-----------	-----------

NOT VOTING—136.

Austin	Gallagher	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Beshlin	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen	Scully
Brodbeck	Glass	Lee, Ga.	Sells
Burnett	Godwin, N. C.	Littlepage	Shackleford
Caldwell	Goodall	Lunn	Shouse
Campbell, Pa.	Gould	McCormick	Siegl
Carew	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Slemp
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	McKeown	Smith, C. B.
Clark, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Cooper, Ohio	Gregg	Mann	Snell
Copley	Griest	Martin	Snyder
Costello	Griffin	Meeker	Stoele
Cramton	Hamill	Merritt	Steenerson
Crosser	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Stephens, Nebr.
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Mudd	Sterling, Pa.
Dale, N. Y.	Harrison, Va.	Nelson	Strong
Dale, Vt.	Heaton	Nichols, Mich.	Sullivan
Decker	Heintz	Norton	Summers
Dempsey	Hicks	Olney	Swift
Denison	Hood	Parker, N. J.	Switzer
Dewalt	Howard	Platt	Talbot
Doelling	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Templeton
Drane	Husted	Porter	Thompson
Drukker	Jacoway	Powers	Tilson
Dupré	James	Pratt	Tinkham
Dyer	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Vare
Eagan	Jones	Rainey, H. T.	Venable
Elston	Juul	Randall	Voigt
Estopinal	Kearns	Rankin	Watson, Pa.
Evans	Kelley, Mich.	Rowland	Welling
Fairchild, G. W.	Kettner	Rucker	Wilson, Ill.
Flynn	Key, Ohio	Sanders, La.	Winslow
Foss	King	Sanford	Wright
Freeman	Kreider	Scott, Iowa	Zihlman

So the amendment to strike out was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. DENISON.

Mr. MARTIN with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINY with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. VENABLE with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. CROSSER with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. DRANE with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. FREEMAN.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. JUUL.
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. MCCORMICK.
 Mr. LARSEN with Mr. MERRITT.
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. RANDALL with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. STEENPERSON.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. WELLING with Mr. VOIGT.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT]. I voted "yea." If he were present, I believe he would vote the same way, so I will let my vote stand.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Iowa: Page 2, line 16, after the word "act," insert the following:

"Provided, That those persons registered under the provisions of this act shall be placed at the bottom of the list of those liable for military service in the several classes to which they are assigned, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Does that refer to the boys now becoming 21?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GORDON. It does, though.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment speaks for itself. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. FIELDS) there were—ayes 119, noes 81.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, leave was given to Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DARROW, Mr. FESS, and Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LEHLBACH, for three days, to participate in the liberty-loan campaign;

To Mr. SIEGEL, for five days, on account of liberty-loan speeches he is to make;

To Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, indefinitely, on account of important business; and

To Mr. SHOUSE, for 10 days, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TO-MORROW.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will indulge me for a moment, I desire to say that it is now nearly 5 o'clock, and it seems rather late to go into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the mining bill. I want to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal, I shall call it up and pass it, if possible, to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. I infer from the gentleman's statement that the report we have seen in the press that the House will adjourn to-morrow is a mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know anything about that. I have not had any request of that kind.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is not my intention to move an adjournment of the House to-morrow, but to stay here and do business. [Applause.] I do not think that the parade of the House or the Senate in this demonstration to-morrow would add 10 cents

to the sale of the bonds. I think we ought to stay here and work. [Applause.]

ACCOUNTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of H. Res. 307, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of H. Res. 307, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Rules. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any objection to that motion. This bill was first referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, which clearly had no jurisdiction of it, as determined by the House this morning. The House sent the bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

I doubt somewhat the propriety of a committee passing upon a resolution which confers special powers and privileges on that committee itself. I doubt, too, whether under parliamentary law this resolution ought to go to the Post Office Committee. For that reason, and for the further reason that it is not strictly a legislative resolution, but one that determines power over the investigation by the House, I think it ought to go to the Committee on Rules. I am not speaking for the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, because the committee has had no meeting; but expressing my own views, as chairman of that committee, I see no reason why, properly, this resolution should not go to the Committee on Rules rather than to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9832. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing dikes, flumes, and other works to confine the waters of Lowell Creek for the protection of said town.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4246) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 513), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9747) to provide temporary increased rank for officers of the United States Coast Guard while operating as a part of the Navy during the period of the present war, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 514), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. WALTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 918) for the relief of William E. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 516), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4239) for the relief of Dora Gaines Delano, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 517), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11691) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Marshfield, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. Sisson: A bill (H. R. 11692) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 11693) for the relief of purchasers from the State of Utah of lands in sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11694) to amend the public-building act approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 323) increasing the compensation of the majority and minority messengers in charge of telephones; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SWIFT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the entrance of the United States into a league of nations for the preservation of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the entrance of the United States into a league of nations to safeguard peace after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring a league of nations to safeguard peace after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11695) to create a rural credits society and general insurance league to facilitate the increase in farm production, to create two fiscal and financial agents for the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution (H. Res. 324) to increase the salaries of the two chief pages of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 11696) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Hager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 11697) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Martell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11698) granting pension to Elizabeth Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11699) granting an increase of pension to James Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11700) granting an increase of pension to Louis G. Murray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11701) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Matteson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11702) granting a pension to Miley Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11703) granting an increase of pension to John A. J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11704), granting a pension to Angellia Meredith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11705) granting an increase of pension to Victor Fousse; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 11706) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11707) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11708) granting a pension to Julia L. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Letter of the Journal of Commerce, New York City, protesting against the zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution passed at Easter week meeting of the United Irish-American Societies, concerning the independence of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, favoring a budget system by the National Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Women's Club of Stevens Point, Wis., against increase of second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolutions of the Liberty League of Woodland, Cal., petitioning Congress to enact a law to punish persons and organizations responsible for pro-German activities or for the publication or public utterance tending to impede the success of the United States in the war, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Protests against the zone system for second-class postage rates by the Board of Commerce, Dunkirk, N. Y.; the Mount Washington Presbyterian Church, New York City; the International Confectioner (Inc.), New York City; the Westminister class of the West Presbyterian Church, Binghamton, N. Y.; the New York State Federation of Labor; and the National Civic Federation, New York and New Jersey section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of the Boot and Shoe Travelers' Association against the zone system for second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, advocating a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. F. W. Willoughby, of Rockford, Ill., and of the Tacoma (Wash.) Business Woman's Club, opposing increase of second-class postage rates and the zone system; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring establishment of a free port system in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Southwestern Millers' League, urging the passage of House bill 10957; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Henry B. Smith and 19 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of E. J. Coburn and 111 others, against appointment of United States representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Elmer J. Conburn and 109 others, of Columbiana County, Ohio, asking repeal of zone postal law relating to newspapers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Memorial of the Minneapolis Municipal Nonpartisan League, in convention at Minneapolis, Minn., April 21, asking the support of the President and the Democratic administration for the national suffrage amendment; also asking the Senate's support for equal suffrage in the interest of democracy at home; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution drawn up and signed by 30 members of the Pearldale Farm Center, Pearldale, Cal., protesting against the zone system and urging its repeal; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution adopted by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, requesting prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions favoring partial payments of war excess-profit taxes from Rudolph Schreiber, Blogg & Litaeur, New York City; Frank Gilbert Paper Co., Eddy Valve Co., Waterford, N. Y.; Hiss, McLean & Haskins, Binghamton, N. Y.; Larkin & Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Bolton Worsted Mills, Methuen, Mass.; Klee Bros., Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTY. Petitions of U. M. Cochran et al., of Delphos, and Col. Ed Ammon, of Gordon, Ohio, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.